



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 2016

No. 62

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. There are many important issues to be considered, with multiple interests and priorities dividing the House in its deliberations.

May the inertia of habit that has solidified various blocs of opinion be stirred to productive action, and grant that a new light might shine on creative solutions to longstanding and vexing disagreement.

The benefit of so many Americans depends on the creativity and intentions of those who serve here. May their hopes and prayers for constructive legislation be satisfied through Your divine grace and the goodwill of all in this Chamber.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural district in northern California where many of my constituents can only access the Internet through dial-up or low-speed DSL. Lack of access to broadband in rural areas is a drag on economic growth and impacts our small businesses, schools, hospitals, and much more.

Recently, the House took action to ensure the FCC cannot regulate the rates charged for broadband Internet access by passing H.R. 2666.

There is no regulatory scheme the FCC can create that will magically solve the challenge of expanding broadband access in high-cost areas. Instead, likely, it will be a hindrance as it creates more barriers to that access.

Expanding broadband in rural areas requires an understanding of the economic realities, recognizing the need for greater access, and removing the regulatory uncertainty.

Adoption of H.R. 2666 will encourage investment by letting Internet service providers know they will not have to face the threat of Federal regulations on the rates they charge and continue the push for broadband access and investment in rural areas, which will be very helpful for people who have to drive a long distance for education and the telemedicine that is so critical in rural areas.

PRESIDENT OBAMA SHOULD VISIT HIROSHIMA, JAPAN

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage President Obama to become the first sitting American President to visit Hiroshima, Japan.

A visit to Hiroshima is not an apology on America's behalf. It is a signal that the Commander in Chief of the world's largest arsenal of nuclear weapons appreciates their power, and it sets an example for other world leaders to follow.

I did not fully grasp the horror of Hiroshima until I traveled there for the first time in 2002. Only then did I develop a personal and lasting connection to the incredible destruction caused by nuclear weapons. Every leader who has the capacity to use these weapons should have that same experience and feel that same connection.

One of America's greatest strengths is the power to lead by example. The President should use that power to lead the world to Hiroshima and away from nuclear weapons.

GOD BLESS A TRUE TEXAN, BOB SCHULTZ

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I come from Texas. The world thinks that Texans take care of Texans, and Texans always brag about Texas. We do.

The Fort Bend Star introduced me to Bob Schultz. I work for Bob. Bob lives in Richmond, Texas. He is 51 years old.

Bob was given a death sentence—pancreatic cancer. After 19 rounds of chemotherapy, tons of radiation, and endless surgeries, Bob beat his cancer.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1899

Bob recovered by volunteering almost daily at the MD Anderson Hospital in Sugar Land, to make sure that coffee is made at 5:30 in the morning and that the linens are prepared for the 6 a.m. opening of that great facility.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close with seven words of Texas pride: God bless a true Texan, Bob Schultz.

GALESBURG WATER SAFETY

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, whether you are a mayor, a city council member, or a Member of Congress, it is the job of all elected officials to be problem solvers for the families we serve.

For almost 25 years, the city of Galesburg has had a problem. The majority of water tests there have had lead content exceeding the Federal action level, and the most recent health report shows that more than 14 percent of children tested in Knox County had high lead levels in their small bodies.

When there is a problem, especially a serious problem like this, leaders come together to solve it. They don't point fingers, and they certainly do not deny facts. Government officials at all levels have the responsibility to work constructively to solve the problem and protect our children.

That is why I have assigned a watchdog task force within my office to investigate lead contamination throughout my congressional district and develop comprehensive solutions to overcome this challenge.

We need to work together to solve this problem because that is what leaders do.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize heroes in our communities who ask for no recognition, too often receive none, and every day are deserving of it: our law enforcement officers.

Their mission is simple: keep our communities safe.

They are often overlooked, yet they are the first ones we call when we need help.

It is a dangerous job. Each day these selfless servants put on a badge symbolic of their unique position to ensure the safety of the families and individuals of their communities, and they go do their duty.

We enjoy the fruits of their labor without knowing of the tireless dedication that makes it happen. Whether they are encouraging a child to make wise decisions, patrolling a neighborhood, or stopping a crime, their tireless dedication is often taken for granted. They sacrifice so we don't have to.

So, Mr. Speaker, to our law enforcement officers around the country and

to their families whose sacrifices are not forgotten, I rise to say thank you. Thank you for protecting us. Thank you for defending us, for being ever vigilant, ever ready, and ever courageous. We appreciate you and stand with you as you serve as the guardians of our communities.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WE THE PEOPLE

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding group of students in my district from Highlands High School in Fort Thomas. These students are members of the We the People team at their high school.

They recently won the State championship and will compete in the national-level program here in Washington, D.C., this weekend, representing the State of Kentucky. This is the 12th consecutive year this team has won this competition in Kentucky.

We the People is a civics education program that promotes teaching and learning about our Nation's history, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Each year, the program hosts a national competition in Washington, D.C., in which individual State-level winning teams compete and participate in simulated congressional hearings.

I am so proud of these students in my district, their parents, their teachers, and the administration of Highlands High School for their hard work and dedication.

Congratulations again, and I wish you all the best in the National Finals.

A LIFE OF SERVICE

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the many accomplishments of the Honorable James Roddey, a dedicated husband, father, and grandfather, successful businessman, public servant, and United States marine. Jim, a native of North Carolina, found opportunity where generations of Americans have—western Pennsylvania.

Last month, Jim stepped down as chairman of the Allegheny County Republican Committee. His tenure as county GOP chairman was the latest act in a career that included his historic election as Allegheny County's first-ever county executive in 1999.

Throughout his successful business career, Jim applied his acumen and heart of service to community development and the nonprofit sector. Undoubtedly, Jim developed many of the values he applied in his career from his Marine Corps days, where he reached the rank of captain.

Jim's peers and colleagues admire him for his ability to get the job done.

He approached his career with exuberance and unmitigated diligence, creating a lasting impact on western Pennsylvania.

I wish him as well as his wife of more than 60 years, Elin, all the best in their future endeavors.

ENSURING INTEGRITY IN THE IRS WORKFORCE ACT OF 2015

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 688, I call up the bill (H.R. 3724) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 688, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-48, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3724

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON REHIRING ANY EMPLOYEE OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE WHO WAS INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED FROM SERVICE FOR MISCONDUCT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 7804 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) PROHIBITION ON REHIRING EMPLOYEES INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED.—The Commissioner may not employ any individual previously employed by the Commissioner who was removed for misconduct under this subchapter or chapter 43 or chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, or whose employment was terminated under section 1203 of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (26 U.S.C. 7804 note)."

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any employee removed from employment before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3724, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 3724, Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act.

With tax day just behind us, most Americans have finished their tax returns. They filled out form after form, giving the IRS some of the most sensitive information possible, including their Social Security numbers, their birth dates, wage data, and more.

In 2014, the inspector general for the IRS released a report that raised serious questions about whose hands this information falls into once it arrives at the IRS. More specifically, an audit of the agency's hiring practices found that the IRS rehired hundreds of former employees whom the IRS had previously fired because of conduct problems.

And we are not talking about small infractions. The IRS rehired employees who had falsified documents. They failed to pay their own taxes. They accessed sensitive taxpayer information without permission.

To think that someone could inappropriately access tax information, get fired for doing so, and then be rehired just a few months later is completely unacceptable. But it has happened, and it has happened more than once.

These stories border on the absurd. One employee had been absent without leave for a total of 8 weeks worth of work. As a result, that employee was fired, and the words "do not rehire" were stamped on that personnel file. Still, the IRS rehired that person.

IRS leadership has failed to acknowledge its mistakes or change its processes. Instead, they stuck their heads in the sand. According to the inspector general, the IRS' response to the report was that it believed its current process was good enough. Well, I don't buy it, and if the IRS leadership thinks its current processes are protecting taxpayers, they need a reality check.

□ 0915

The Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act is a simple, bipartisan fix to a serious problem. The bill does what the IRS bureaucracy in Washington won't: it stops the IRS from rehiring former employees who had been fired for cause.

Now, my staff and I met with numerous frontline IRS employees from South Dakota who are sincere and hardworking individuals. My bill is not aimed at them.

This legislation is aimed at the IRS bureaucracy in Washington and is intended to address a very real problem that they have refused to fix.

There is no reason that IRS leadership in Washington shouldn't be held to

the same standard to which it holds you, the taxpayers. With this legislation, we can hold the IRS accountable to us for its hiring practices and ensure a high-quality workforce for the agency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all agree that the IRS faces serious consumer service challenges and needs to be more responsive to the American taxpayer, but this bill is not a serious attempt at oversight of the IRS.

In fact, with respect to making the IRS more responsive to taxpayers, this bill is a move in the wrong direction.

But the fact that Republicans are moving in the wrong direction on tax policy really shouldn't be a surprise to any of us.

They are not only starving our entire government of the resources that it needs to operate efficiently for the American public, but they are deliberately standing in the way of actual productive policies.

Forget real tax reform that would bring positive benefits. They aren't even doing anything to fix what is broken in the system today.

For example, the Republicans refuse to crack down on large corporations that seek to avoid paying their fair share of taxes simply by changing their mailing address from the United States to a low-tax foreign country.

We see these stories on TV all the time, corporations renouncing their American citizenship to not have to pay any—any—U.S. taxes.

But congressional Republicans have refused to take any action to stop these corporate tax dodgers and the resulting offshoring of American jobs.

In fact, the Republicans who run Congress have protected these companies not only through their refusal to act to stop these tax inversions, but by also refusing to repeal the tax break that incentivizes U.S. companies to ship jobs overseas.

Yes, American companies can claim a tax break for firing American workers and moving their jobs overseas, and my Republican colleagues are doing nothing about that.

The real-world effect of the Republicans' refusal to go after these corporations that invert themselves to avoid paying their share of taxes is a heavier tax burden on the rest of our honest constituents who are playing by the rules.

To address this problem, the Treasury Department recently issued new rules to stop large corporations from simply changing their post office box to avoid paying U.S. taxes.

Could my constituents imagine simply changing their post office box address to eliminate their Federal taxes? Of course not. Because they can't. But somehow multinational companies, which seem to have more rights than American citizens, can.

Now, you would think the American Congress would support the efforts of the American President to stop American companies from not paying the taxes here in America. But, Mr. Speaker, you would be wrong.

The majority is threatening to stop the Treasury from advancing these types of commonsense rules to make multinational corporations pay their fair share of U.S. taxes just like everyone else.

Wouldn't our time be better spent and served if my Republican colleagues held hearings—and passed bills—to stop companies from moving their jobs and profits overseas?

Democrats stand ready to work with them to enact commonsense policies to close the loopholes in our Tax Code that encourage companies to send their profits and their jobs overseas.

Unfortunately, we will have to wait for another day before the majority is serious about working together to make our tax system fairer for working people.

But let me be clear. Americans will not wait any longer. They demand that we act to close these loopholes to ensure that American corporations don't cheat the system to try to avoid paying their fair share of taxes here in the United States, letting the little guy have a greater burden in their absence.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have a gentlemen here to speak on behalf of my bill who has been a strong leader in bringing integrity to the IRS.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we are at a crossroads with our tax system. Our Tax Code is outdated, overly complicated, and the IRS has proven that it, in and of itself, is in need of serious reform.

Here is an opportunity for us to work together. From the opening remarks of my colleague across the aisle, I am not sure if that is an attitude of cooperation, but certainly this is a bill we can work together on, I would hope.

Our Tax Code was last updated in 1986, a generation ago. It is increasingly burdensome in this global 21st century economy. American taxpayers need a simpler code that they can easily comply with.

Finally, they deserve an accountable and consistent IRS which provides exceptional taxpayer customer service. It is long past time for the status quo to change on these problems. We need tax reform.

This is why I stand in support of my colleague's bill, the Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act. The legislation would prohibit the IRS from rehiring any individual who was previously employed by the IRS, but fired for cause. This is inconsistent and unacceptable behavior from an agency which requires the highest standard of tax compliance from taxpayers. The IRS should apply the same rigorous standard inside the agency itself.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we didn't need an act of Congress such as this, but, apparently, we do. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I have a friend and colleague here today who has fought daily for years for hard-working taxpayers across America and for his home district.

I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Hamlin County, South Dakota, a very dear friend not only of every Member of Congress, but, in particular, a great Representative representing South Dakota at a time when South Dakota needs not only strong representation, but a strong voice.

I want to thank the young Congresswoman for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, today is quite simple. The United States Congress has a say in the matter about how our government is run and the conduct of the government.

The Internal Revenue Service has, for quite some time, been at odds, I believe, not only with their mission statement, but also at odds with their duty to publicly serve, provide information, and to do the things that enable taxpayers, who want to follow the law and need to follow the law, to comply respectfully.

The Internal Revenue Service, over the last few years, has run afoul, I believe, of the American people because the commonsense obligations that they have have not been met.

Today we are here on the floor with Congresswoman NOEM to talk about H.R. 3724 that prohibits the Commissioner of the IRS from rehiring any employee who was involuntarily—that means forced—out or involuntarily separated from service for misconduct at the Internal Revenue Service.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration reported in February 2015 that the IRS had rehired those employees who had been fired from the Service for misconduct, hundreds of former employees who were terminated for well-documented conduct or performance issues.

In fact, the IRS rehired 141 former employees who had substantial tax issues. That means they were not paying their own tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, if we were going to hire a person in our office, we would attempt to gain information about that employee.

Yesterday, as we were talking about this on the rule, a fellow colleague said: What about your own employees? Do you make sure they pay their taxes?

I said: That would be a good question.

No, I don't ask that question. But I would not have any idea what the real

answer was—the truth—if an employee did not tell me the truth.

The IRS does have the answer. They know who is paying their taxes, and they know why they fired an employee, Mr. Speaker.

We are here saying that the Internal Revenue Service should not rehire these employees who were unfaithful, unfaithful to their job and unfaithful to the American taxpayer.

One hundred forty-one employees who substantially did not pay their taxes represent 60 percent of all terminated for misconduct.

I think I know why: because the Internal Revenue Service at the highest levels allows this to go on, and then they rehire the employees who didn't even follow the law.

Mr. Speaker, that is not just misconduct. That is another level giving them an opportunity that a normal taxpayer would not have to get away with not paying their own taxes.

Other misconduct issues of rehiring employees include accessing taxpayer information improperly without authorization, falsification of official forms, unacceptable behavior and performance, and abuse of IRS leave and property policies while on public time.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman NOEM is doing the right thing and so is the House of Representatives. I would like to see this be a bipartisan issue, not a partisan issue.

We need the IRS. We need them to do a good job. But if this were at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, would we allow that to happen? If this were at the CIA, would we allow that to happen?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. If this were at the Department of Justice, would we allow that to happen? Why is this not a bipartisan issue?

Why can't we get together and say: Mr. Koskinen, you are the Commissioner of the IRS. We respectfully would like to see you correct what you are doing.

We are not on a witch hunt. We have the facts of the case, and we believe the right thing to do is to offer some remedy.

That is why Republicans are on the floor today, and that is why our young Congresswoman is leading this charge.

I stand behind her. I voted for the rule, and I am going to vote for this. It does the right thing.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would just add to that list of the gentleman from Texas: If it were Congress, would we allow this to happen?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, we have another colleague here on the floor

today who serves on the Ways and Means Committee and has diligently worked on IRS issues and has been a leader on bringing some clarity to the situations that we deal with in trying to bring integrity to the IRS.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3724, the Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act of 2015, a bill sponsored by my good friend and colleague, Representative KRISTI NOEM of South Dakota. As the previous colleague said, this should be a bipartisan issue. This is an American issue.

I spent most of my life in the business world. I have owned and operated over 60 different businesses, employed over 3,000 people, and created thousands of new jobs. Throughout my 30-year business career, I have had the privilege of hiring many new, talented individuals.

When it comes to hiring at the IRS, the Treasury inspector general stated, "Selecting the best candidates for employment is essential to providing the best service to America's taxpayers, maintaining public trust in tax administration, and safeguarding taxpayer's rights and privacy."

However, the inspector general report from December 2014 found that the IRS fell short of that standard. Last year the IRS hired hundreds of employees who were terminated for misconduct. Those serious offenses included willful failure to file tax returns, unauthorized access to taxpayer information, falsification of official forms, and abuse of IRS leave and property policies.

□ 0930

As a businessman, but more importantly as a representative of the American taxpayer, I find this IG report inexcusable. It seems obvious to me, but not once did I rehire someone in the real world—in the real world—who I had previously fired for misconduct.

The IRS needs to earn the trust of hardworking American taxpayers. Rehiring employees who were fired for these serious offenses further erodes that trust.

H.R. 3724 directly addresses this issue. It prohibits the IRS from rehiring employees that were fired for misconduct. This is common sense.

As a former businessowner, I know it is a very difficult decision to let someone go, but rehiring an individual who was asked to leave due to gross misconduct would be insulting to other employees who have faithfully served the business, and would present a significant risk to the health of the organization and its customers.

The IG report found the IRS doesn't take those risks seriously. In fact, "IRS officials stated that prior conduct and performance issues do not play a significant role in deciding the candidates who are best qualified for hiring." Because the IRS hasn't taken

those risks seriously, this straightforward, commonsense legislation is needed to restore accountability and trust in the IRS.

I would like to commend Mrs. NOEM for her leadership on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that America will have to continue to wait for action to stop companies from shifting American jobs overseas and stopping corporate tax dodgers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3724.

I would think as we look around the country right now, the integrity of what our government is and how our voters are represented and our citizens are represented, is really the case here.

I thank the gentlewoman for bringing such a commonsense piece of legislation forward because we know in this town there is nothing less common than common sense.

The faith and trust of the American people is based on their belief that the people who work for them are acting in their best interest, always acting in their best interest—the interest of the American people. Not in their personal interest, but in the interest of the American people. We find out that there are folks who are working on behalf of the American people, but they have somehow betrayed that faith and that trust. And folks have lost confidence in their government. They have lost confidence because of things that happened, not things that were imagined, not some whimsical idea that somehow we can get at somebody for doing this.

There is no agency that is feared more in this country than the IRS. The question is: Why would they be so feared? Because they can completely shut you down, they can freeze your bank account, they can make you stay up late at night worrying about what is going to happen.

When you get that letter from the IRS, the next thing you do is contact an attorney to represent you because you don't want to make a mistake, you just don't want to do it. But then you find out that within the IRS, people working for that agency, but, more importantly, working for the people of the United States, have violated that trust.

These are substantiated results. This is not somebody's idea or way of getting back at somebody. This is removing bad apples and saying: you have violated, you have betrayed the trust of the American people, you are going to leave the agency, but, more importantly, you are never coming back in.

This isn't any way to somehow get back at a political party or get back at

anybody. This is a fact that if we cannot restore the confidence the American people have in us—their faith and their trust—why are we here? Why do we go through elections?

I don't come here to represent my ideas and my beliefs. I come here to represent the values and beliefs of Pennsylvania's Third Congressional District. That is 705,687 Americans, not Republicans, not Democrats, not Libertarians, not Independents, but Americans.

This piece of legislation takes into account that these are wrongdoers. These are not people who we want to associate ourselves with. These are people who have used the power of their office or of their position to somehow work against the very people who employ them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would just say, at this moment in our history, I thank the gentlewoman for standing up for every hardworking American taxpayer and doing the best we can to restore the faith and confidence of the American people that they can trust who it is that they elect to represent them and they can trust us to make sure that wrongdoers are punished and, once are asked to leave, are not allowed to come back in.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 24½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from South Dakota has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mrs. NOEM and her drive to address this very important issue.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people who work at the IRS are good, hardworking, patriotic people who want to do the right thing. I have a serious problem with management and I have a serious problem with the head of the IRS, but on this issue, this is just unbelievable that we can't come to a conclusive and absolute 100 percent agreement.

All we are asking for is that the bad apples, the people who will disturb what is going on in the workplace, who aren't going to act in the best interest of the United States of America, that they be excluded from participation.

One of the things that is fascinating, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this, is in response to the independent review that was done of the IRS and their hiring practices. And the question here is: Should we go back and review the personnel employment file prior to rehiring somebody?

This is what they said: "Additionally, while it did find that a review of performance and conduct issues could be accomplished earlier in the process, the Department of Treasury, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Internal Revenue Service believed that it was not feasible to move the review of these issues earlier in the hiring process. This action would greatly increase the cost of hiring, likely increase cycle time beyond the Presidential mandate of 80 days, require additional resources, and not likely yield a reasonable return on investment."

Come on. Come on. Are you kidding me? How long could it possibly take to actually go back and review somebody's performance reviews, look back at their employment history, and see if they have been acting in the best interest of the United States of America?

Clearly, in the examples that are there, there are people that willfully don't even file their own tax returns, there are people that are doing some bad, stupid stuff.

They don't think they have the time and resources to look at it in advance; we have to actually pass a piece of legislation requiring this?

That seems entirely reasonable. It is not overly burdensome. Here you have an organization, the IRS, that can actually destroy somebody's life by a mere letter showing up in your mailbox, and they can't even take the time to look at somebody's employment history, somebody who has already worked at the IRS?

That is how absurd this organization is, and that is why this piece of legislation is so easy to understand, it is so easy to vote for. It is not a partisan issue. This is just saying: Do you know what? For all the good people who work at the IRS, let's make sure that the new people who come on, or the rehires who come on, in this case, are actually addressed and we look at their information prior to hiring.

It is that simple. That is why I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I am still waiting for a bill to keep American jobs in America and not export them overseas through the Tax Code. I will continue to wait for that bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, today, we are talking about a bill that will bring integrity to the IRS, which will better serve our taxpayers into the future.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota for her leadership in bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about restoring trust. This bill is about holding the IRS accountable. Here we are, in a week where Americans had to file their tax returns. And so often, just the letters I-R-S send a chilling effect through people when they hear those

letters. Yet, you look at the arrogance over at the IRS, just the attitude that they have and the disdain it seems that they have towards the very people who pay their bills—the taxpayers.

Here you have a case where people who have been fired by the IRS for abusing their positions are actually being rehired back to the IRS. Again, this is the kind of disdain that disgusts people as they fear the IRS. The IRS ought to have the same fear towards the people who pay their salaries as people get when they get that letter from the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, we have had inspector general reports in the Treasury Department. The inspector general found over 140 IRS agents aren't even accurate in their taxes. The very people who are responsible for auditing American citizens aren't even paying their own taxes.

This is the kind of disregard for the American people that we are seeing over at the IRS, and it is time to rein it in. It is time to bring some accountability and transparency back to the IRS.

Who is afraid of that? What is so wrong with saying: If somebody has been fired for cause over at the IRS, with the access they have to such sensitive personal information of taxpayers, why should they be rehired back?

It is just basic common sense that if somebody has abused their position at the IRS, enough is enough, and they shouldn't be able to return and have access to that sensitive information anymore.

I want to applaud, again, the gentlewoman from South Dakota for bringing this commonsense bill forward. I would urge adoption later on when we have this vote on the House floor.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my friend from South Dakota for her leadership in holding the IRS accountable for what we are seeing today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3724, the Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act, to join in the outrage with my colleagues today on what we are seeing at the IRS. With tax day hitting earlier this week, I think this is an ideal time to highlight the need for continued oversight and, perhaps, ramped-up oversight of the Internal Revenue Service.

Last February, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration reported that the IRS had a tendency to rehire former employees with serious misconduct and performance issues. In their review, they found more than 100 former employees were rehired by the IRS despite having significant performance and misconduct problems, like willfully failing to file tax returns: a

rather important thing for most of us, but apparently not for IRS employees.

Mr. Speaker, the families in my district and I are 100 percent fed up with adhering to a standard that the IRS doesn't even hold their own employees to. We simply will not tolerate the rehiring of incompetent individuals who fail to do their job in the first place. It is time to put a leash on the IRS and prevent taxpayers from further double standards and further abuse.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3724.

Again, I thank my colleague from South Dakota for her excellent leadership on this. I look forward to open debate and voting on this matter as soon as possible.

□ 0945

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

No disrespect to the sponsor of this bill whatsoever. I have great admiration for her, as she knows, but I believe that this bill could have been taken up on the consent calendar, quite frankly, with all of this discussion about the support on both sides.

The reality is, though, that we are using precious time here on the floor on an issue that, as I say, could have been on the consent calendar. We are not addressing the real issue of concern to the American people, which is of the continuing loss of jobs here in America because of our Tax Code, which we refuse to fix, that is shifting jobs and American corporations overseas to inversion and also shifting American jobs overseas because of those inversions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we are not having a hearing on this. We are not doing anything here on the floor to address this issue. Instead, we are taking up issues that, quite frankly, could have been on the consent calendar.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am ready to close.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I believe this should be the beginning and not the end of a discussion on how to best plug the giant corporate loopholes that are allowing companies to skip out on paying the same taxes that all of our constituents have to pay. This is one of the many major issues this Congress should undertake; but, instead, we are all too busy governing by press releases.

This Congress has done nothing to address the Zika virus, which could be a threat to all women who are pregnant or who are looking to become pregnant; but we have this consent bill here on the floor for debate.

This Congress has done nothing to address the crisis of lead in our drinking water—a crisis vividly on display in Flint but one that lurks in the pipes of

hundreds of cities and towns across our great land; yet we have this consent bill here on the calendar for debate.

This Congress hasn't even attempted to pass a budget for our country—the majority has not proposed a budget for our country—which is one of the most basic functions we can do as an institution to make sure we make the necessary investments possible while also getting our economic house in order; yet we have what I would consider to be a consent calendar bill here on the floor today, taking up an hour's debate.

But we will always have time for message bills. Sure, they don't create a job for an unemployed person in New York or in Flint or in Houston or in L.A., and they don't increase the take-home pay of any underpaid worker or make college more affordable for middle class kids or strengthen Social Security for our seniors of today and tomorrow, but they will sound great on talk radio tonight and over the weekend—we are going after the IRS again. They don't even deal with the Tax Code even though this bill is advertised as the Republicans' idea of tax reform. It does not reform the Tax Code in any way, shape, or form, but that is what they portray it as.

Let me explain something about the Tax Code to my Republican colleagues.

Our Tax Code is inefficient. You see that when large corporations are paying less tax than the employees who work for them. It is overly complicated. You see that when multinational corporations avoid paying the same taxes as our constituents back home have to pay simply by their hiring expensive lawyers that our constituents, quite frankly, cannot afford. It is unfair. You see that when corporations can dodge paying their fair share of taxes by simply switching their post office boxes to foreign countries—something our neighbors back home, if they attempted to do, would be arrested for, for tax evasion, but not corporations. Individuals, if you do that, you are arrested for tax evasion, but not an American corporation; yet my Republican colleagues continue to refuse to address this issue.

Maybe more importantly than anything else, it does not promote job growth here in the United States. You see this when Congress refuses to repeal the tax breaks for companies to fire their workers here and move their jobs overseas.

This Congress must tackle these serious issues, but we are not doing that today. We continue to wait for legislation—for a hearing—on these important issues.

Democrats stand ready to work with you all, my Republican colleagues, on commonsense legislation that plugs the corporate tax loopholes that are literally draining the funds our country needs in order to function properly. Democrats stand ready to work with you to fix the Tax Code that is not only inefficient, not only complicated, not

only unfair, but that does not promote job growth here in the United States. That is something we want to work with you on in a bipartisan way. Unfortunately, we have to continue to wait for another day before the majority is serious about working together, in a bipartisan way, to make our tax system fairer for all working men and women in the United States. Let me be clear, once again, that the American people will not wait any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard repeatedly from my colleague on the other side of the aisle about why we should not be spending time on this topic today, about why we shouldn't have dedicated an hour's worth of debate to making sure that we talk about H.R. 3724, Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act.

I think he has forgotten about what kind of information the people of this country turn over to the IRS. They turn over their Social Security numbers, their financial information; a lot of the security that they have for their families, their homes, and their businesses they completely trust the IRS to take care of, to protect, and to make sure that they use in the correct manner so that they might abide by the law and pay their taxes like honest, hardworking Americans do. To say that we shouldn't spend time in making sure that criminals and people who are fired for misconduct don't have access to that information, to me, is silly. That is exactly what our job is. The IRS needs integrity, and we are here to bring it today.

Mr. Speaker, the White House has issued a veto threat against this bill. They said that the IRS would be forced to fire people, because of this bill, if it were signed into law. I read the White House's Statement of Administration Policy on my bill, and the statement reads that it is unnecessary because current IRS processes already ensure that the agency does not rehire former employees who have significant conduct issues.

I guess the White House didn't read the report, for the inspector general expressed concerns that the IRS continues to hire individuals who have significant prior conduct and performance issues even after the agency supposedly made upgrades to its hiring practices.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the inspector general's review of former employees who were fired for serious misconduct and who were then rehired included employees with histories of fraud, a falsification of documents, workplace disruption, absence, and an unauthorized accessing of taxpayer information. The inspector general identified approximately 140 individuals who are currently, today, with the IRS who had been previously fired for cause. We are talking about an agency that employs 80,000 people. Surely, it can find 140 people who haven't committed fraud or falsified documents.

Mr. Speaker, the inspector general recommended that the IRS reassess its hiring practices to determine in what part of the process it should fully vet candidates in terms of their prior performance. In fact, the IRS was given an opportunity to fully respond to the inspector general's report. In its response, the agency insisted its processes were sufficient. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the agency still only begins to vet the candidates for employment only after the entire hiring process is completed and after a formal offer of employment has been extended. So, regardless of any changes the IRS has made to its hiring practices, the inspector general said he remains very concerned because IRS documents indicate it is hiring individuals who have significant prior conduct and performance issues.

Mr. Speaker, because the IRS hasn't taken action is why we are here today. This bill is simple. It just says that the IRS cannot rehire employees who have been fired for misconduct. It is something the IRS should have taken action on; and because they didn't, that is why we are here today. It is our job to protect the taxpayers and to make sure their information is safe with the agency that they, by law, need to turn over to the IRS.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

BAN ON IRS BONUSES UNTIL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY DEVELOPS COMPREHENSIVE CUSTOMER SERVICE STRATEGY

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 4890.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 688 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4890.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0957

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to impose a ban on the payment of bonuses to employees of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary of the Treasury develops and implements a comprehensive customer service strategy, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am before the House today—really, before the Nation—on behalf of all of those frustrated taxpayers who have spent a great part of the last month, if not months before, in preparing their taxes in what is an increasingly complex Code. While we have a mission to simplify that Code, the fact of the matter is they have to deal with the challenges that they face today.

One of the agencies that they interact with or hope to interact with when they have questions is something called the Internal Revenue Service. I want to focus on that third word—"service"—because the idea here is we don't have some oversight agency, and we don't have some agency whose obligation and purpose in life is to make it harder on the average hardworking taxpayers, who are supporting the government with the money that they earn; it is to be a service—to use their resources to help the hardworking Americans who must pay taxes—and to simplify the process, particularly when they have questions of a very, very complex Code and its requirements that are being put on each and every one of them. When we talk about service, what we need to see is a pattern; and what we see is a pattern by which, unfortunately, the service of the IRS is deteriorating rapidly.

Let me give you the facts, and I am talking about what they call the answer time.

When an individual gets on the telephone because he is frustrated and he calls the IRS and says, "I have a question," this year, the IRS estimates it will receive 48.4 million calls with people asking for assistance. Do you know how many they will answer? Sixteen million. That means that 32 million

taxpayers will call the service, and their calls will go unanswered.

□ 1000

What kind of private entity could survive in this day and age if that was the kind of service that they were providing? What we are seeing is that this is going in a backwards fashion.

If you are able to get through and finally talk to somebody, the wait times a few years ago were 18.7 minutes. Well, how many people who are working at home, have other jobs, are doing things have 18.7 minutes just to wait for a phone call to be answered on an issue that they already have anxiety about? Well, those were the good old days, Mr. Chairman, 18.7 minutes, because today it is 34.4 minutes. If you are one of the lucky 30 percent who even gets their call answered, you wait 34.4 minutes.

It even gets better because what the IRS has implemented is a program now called a courtesy disconnect. Well, if that isn't the most oxymoronic thing that I have heard—a courtesy disconnect. In other words, we are going to tell you ahead of time, when you call, we are going to disconnect your call right away because we are going to tell you you are not going to be able to get through in time, so don't waste your time trying to contact the IRS. Now, that just exacerbates the level of frustration.

So what do we do about it? What is a solution? Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, this isn't something that the Republicans on this side of the aisle have sat and said: Oh, let's go get the IRS.

Mr. Chairman, the GAO, which has overlooked this agency for, now, 3 straight years has been calling on the IRS to do something very simple. What they say is create a strategy and a plan to do a better job of answering those calls, of being responsive to those very taxpayers that your service requires you to do so. Just create a plan. It is that simple.

The GAO issued recommendations to the IRS that they first outline a strategy that defines appropriate levels of telephone and correspondence service and wait time lists and get specific steps to manage service based on an assessment of timeframes, demand capabilities, and resources. Just tell us how you can do it better.

Number two was direct the appropriate officials to systematically and empirically compare its telephone service to the best in business to identify gaps between actual and desired performance; in other words, see how it is being done in other places and aspire to do it as well. Well, as I said again, go back to the private sector. I imagine the people aren't making 60 percent of the people that call, they don't even answer it.

Lastly, just improve taxpayer service by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to develop a comprehensive customer service strategy. That is what the GAO asked them to do. This

recommendation has been repeated year after year. Unfortunately, the response of the IRS to the GAO was that their existing efforts were sufficient. They have yet to devise this plan.

Mr. Chairman, you tell me, when 60 percent of the calls are unanswered and those that are calling have wait times of over 35 minutes, tell me where that is sufficient. And therein lies the heart of the problem, the complete unwillingness to do a simple issue and to be responsive.

Now, there are other reasons, perhaps, that the IRS is diverting the very resources that have been put in by this Congress to support taxpayer services. In fact, the commitment to those taxpayer services has gone down dramatically each and every year:

In 2013, they put \$190 million into ensuring that there were appropriate taxpayer services; and then, in 2014, they decreased it to \$183 million to ensure that there were appropriate taxpayer services; and then, in 2015, they put \$45 million into it.

So at a time when the GAO is telling them to do better, they are speaking with their own specific acts to say: We think it is sufficient. And not only do we think it is sufficient, we are actually pulling resources away from relations to the very taxpayers that we have an obligation to service.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is really quite simple, and it is in response to that continuing unresponsiveness of those who manage the IRS. It is simply saying to do what you have been requested to do.

Now, despite three GAO reports and continuing oversight by Congress, the refusal to be responsive to that, we looked and said a very simple thing. It says do not pay bonuses to the employees until you have fulfilled the very simple requirement of coming up with this plan.

Now, somebody might say to me: Well, that is outrageous. Put new obligations on the IRS. They have not done it in 3 years.

But guess who has? The Department of Labor does it. The Department of Agriculture does it. The Department of Education does it. The Office of Management and Budget does it. Each and every one of them, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, probably have a lot less interaction with everyday Americans, but they have taken the time to put together that plan.

So there is a template. We are not asking a whole lot. It has been specific, laid out in the GAO report, simply to do that.

So we are asking very simply in the bill, do your job; and until you have done that job, which other agencies are very capable of doing, no bonuses get paid.

It doesn't say no bonuses get paid at all. In fact, this is not antiworker. In fact, hardworking people at the IRS—and there are many—they can get rewarded for appropriate work that they do. But don't pay those bonuses until

you, management, answer to them why you won't do the service agreement or service plan. You tell your employees why you won't do it. Don't go blaming it on somebody else. That is the very simple request that we have, which is to make the plan before you write the bonuses.

Mr. Chairman, that is not asking for much. It is certainly not asking for much on behalf of the frustrated taxpayers of the United States who are seeing a demonstrated inability to communicate with the very agency that is responsible for helping them solve the questions that they have with respect to the complexities of the Tax Code.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to continuing to debate this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we are facing today is the worst kind of demagoguery, and really it descends to propaganda.

Look, the reason the phones aren't being answered is because the Republican majority has failed to answer to its responsibilities. The appropriations have been going down. The last 5 years, the budget cut for IRS has been close to \$1 billion.

So you try to hide from your failure and you point your finger everywhere except where it belongs—yourselves. You want to say no bonuses to the 80,000 people because this House majority has failed to meet its basic responsibility, and that is to fund so that there can be adequate resources to answer the phones. You are the ones who have shut it off.

So the problem is not a lack of strategy; it is a lack of resources. The House Republicans are trying to pass the buck because they are not providing the bucks necessary for adequate taxpayer services.

We had this chart yesterday, and here it is again. This shows, in the yellow, the amount of resources. In the blue, it shows the average time to answer the phone. As the resources have gone down, the time it takes has gone up. That is a simple fact. The only time that changed was when this institution provided some adequate resources, and so the time to answer the phones went down.

Now you are back at it again, diminishing the resources, and you are essentially blaming the 80,000 people who don't get the adequate resources to do their jobs.

Now you say let's have a plan. There is already a system, but you don't provide the resources to carry it out. You are saying come up with a plan that will be looked at and approved by the inspector general that doesn't have that responsibility. So that is why the White House stands in opposition, and I read:

"Legislation constraining the IRS's ability to retain and recruit highly qualified employees is not needed and could be counterproductive to the Service's mission."

So I am going to point out other things you haven't done. Mr. CROWLEY laid them out very, very well.

This place, under your leadership, has been bankrupt in terms of addressing the critical needs of the budget, the problems in Flint, the problems faced by Puerto Rico, the problems faced by thousands of people because of Zika. So you come here and you say, well, the IRS isn't doing its job. You are not doing your job. Don't go after an agency for not being able to answer the telephone when you essentially are cutting the lines of resources. It is outrageous. It is outrageous, and I think the people will know.

I say this to my constituents. When you call up and it takes hours, call up your local Member of Congress, especially if he or she a member of the majority here. Call them up. If they don't answer the phone, try email. And if there is no response, call one of us who are working to provide the adequate resources for the IRS to answer the phones, and we will try to find a way for you to communicate with your Member, if that person has failed to meet his responsibilities. The blame is on your doorstep. Don't try to shift it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). Members of the House are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to each other in the second person.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) control the remainder of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey will be recognized.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and his work.

Mr. Chairman, every year the American people pay their taxes; and every year to do that, they have to deal with an agency that is inept and increasingly unethical.

You can't make this stuff up. The IRS failed to answer 8 million calls during tax season last year. Yet, over a short 5-year period, they handed out nearly \$6 million in bonuses to themselves.

□ 1015

Just to make this clear, that means the IRS can't take the taxpayers' phone calls, but they sure as heck can take the taxpayers' money for their bonuses.

Or how about this? The inspector general found that nearly 1,600 IRS employees willfully avoided paying their own taxes over a 10-year period; yet, we trust these same people to collect taxes from their fellow citizens.

How is it that the agency charged with collecting taxes employs people who don't pay their own taxes and that agency does nothing about it?

Now, it doesn't stop there. The IRS has a slush fund of money it collects

from fees that it uses however it wants. No accountability. No transparency.

Meanwhile, about 500 IRS employees have been fired for misconduct, such as snooping on private taxpayers' information; yet, they have been hired back again.

The IRS selectively targeted for sanctions taxpayers who donated to Romney, intimidated nonprofit citizen groups, and sent out millions in potentially fraudulent tax refunds all in the past few years alone. You wonder why American people don't trust their government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to look at these bills on the floor. We are not trying to make some partisan statement here. We just want our government to work for the people and work well. But, to do that, we can't leave the IRS the way it has been.

We had bills yesterday on the floor by Congressmen JASON SMITH and DAVID ROUZER that put an end to the slush funds and to make sure the people working at the IRS actually paid their taxes, and today we are going to pass more bills by KRISTI NOEM and PAT MEEHAN to stop the IRS from hiring people who can't be trusted and to fix the agency's absolutely terrible customer service.

These are good bills. They are smart bills. Frankly, they are bills that make you wonder how any reasonable person could ever vote against them.

But I forgot how irrational some people could be. Just a few days ago the Obama administration said they were against all four of these bills. Really?

They are against accountability? They are against IRS agency employees paying their taxes? They want the IRS to fail to answer the vast majority of customer service calls? They want to rehire bad employees?

I couldn't understand it. Frankly, the administration's statement didn't clear things up either. The Office of Management and Budget actually said this: "These bills would impose unnecessary constraints on the Internal Revenue Service's . . . operations . . ."

Now, let me get one thing out of the way. The administration is worried about imposing constraints on the IRS, but it has no problem imposing constraints and regulations on small businesses, energy producers, manufacturers, to the point that it is driving them out of business.

That shows you how backwards this administration's priorities are. The IRS targets conservative groups, fails at basic tasks, and employs people who don't pay their own taxes.

But the people who are trying to earn an honest living and power their homes and produce products right here in America? The administration thinks they are the problem. They think they need to be regulated.

That is wrong. That is not what our country stands for, and it is not what this majority is going to stand for either.

But there is another principle here. The House is not trying to write some

laws and impose some rules on the IRS just because.

We are trying to restrain government because unaccountable and unelected bureaucrats have shown that they can't be trusted with the power they have been given.

When you say "IRS," I can assure you that the last words people think of are honest, fair, transparent, or even trustworthy.

That is not how our government should be, especially the arm of government entrusted with collecting our taxes.

Because when people can't trust that their government is treating them fairly, they lose faith in politics. They become cynical, and it increases the divisions within our country.

Now, good government shouldn't be a one-party issue. I love the debates about how small or how large government should be or how high or how low taxes should be.

But we can and we should agree that government should do its job well without abusing the trust of the American people. That should never be a one-party argument.

That is what these bills are about. That is what this debate is about. The American people are watching, Mr. Chairman, and they want us to make our choice, good government or bad.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have to respond to the previous speaker, whose simplistic analysis has been exposed during this Presidential election.

We have selective memories. That is our problem, because how can you come before the American people, Mr. Chairman, and explain how X amount of IRS workers have not paid their taxes?

We all want everybody to pay their taxes because when insufficient revenue is in the coffers, we can't pay our bills.

But if the truth be known and we didn't have selective memory, when you point out how many people in the IRS of the 80,000 employees—1,500—haven't paid their taxes or are in default of their taxes, the gentleman fails to mention that one of the biggest culprits in not paying their taxes is the very House of Representatives. My Lord. Five percent of the Members default on their taxes.

Now, what about us and our responsibilities? We are the guardians. We are the guardians. We are the protectors of the taxpayers. Beware, taxpayers. Beware.

I have a great deal of respect—and I hope I have proven it in the past—for the gentleman who has introduced this legislation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN). I just think we are off on the wrong foot on this one.

In your support for the bill, H.R. 4890, you claim to be concerned about IRS customer service. This bill would prohibit any bonuses being paid to IRS

employees until the agency comes up with a customer service strategy approved by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

Customer service is critical. But how can you come here and complain about customer service when you have cut the IRS budget \$1 billion in the last 5 years? That is 13,000 fewer full-time employees.

At the same time—listen to this, Mr. Chairman—there have been 9 million more tax returns being filed. Think about that just for a second: 9 million more tax returns, 13,000 fewer employees, \$1 billion less in appropriations. I mean, that is not rocket science. It is simply arithmetic.

Your budgets have consistently starved the IRS of the resources it needs to do its job, and, true to form, this bill expressly forbids any additional appropriations to carry out this mandate.

Here is the reality. The IRS customer service didn't decline because of lazy employees. It declined because of significant budget cuts. This year, thanks to an extra \$290 million in funding, it has rebounded to about mediocre, still a disservice to many Americans who need help.

So I agree with the ranking member when he says to look in the mirror and you will see who is responsible.

Instead of helping the struggling people of Puerto Rico or Flint, Michigan, or passing a budget—tax day passed a few days ago—this Congress is fiddling with weakening the IRS. You can't deny that all these attempts to harm the IRS are really harming taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me take a moment just to be responsive to a couple of things.

In point of fact, I don't think that I could have had a better setup for the real issues here than the very arguments that have been made by my colleagues because, in fact, when you look behind what is actually going on, you see the scheme that is taking place here, which has put the IRS and the service that it gives to taxpayers right in the middle of the conflict.

What they have done is created a circumstance in which, if you purposely starve the very thing that will relate to the taxpayers, you can get the taxpayers worked up to come back to scream for more money for the Service. Let's blame this on Congress.

But let's talk about what is actually going on here, Mr. Chairman. There may have been budget cuts, as there have been budget cuts all across the government.

One of the budget cuts related to the \$50 million that the IRS has used for conferences. And so, just like every other agency in government, just like the 14 percent cut we have taken in our own offices, there have been cuts at a time in which our government doesn't have money.

But that is not the issue. Because what has happened here has been the

diverting of funding. What nobody is saying is that this same agency has been hit with \$1.7 billion of diverted expenditure to service the Affordable Care Act, the healthcare law that was pushed on us and pushed on all America; \$1.7 billion has been diverted, will be dedicated this year, but never accounted for when that program was created.

They put this responsibility, another unfunded mandate put on the agency by this law. What they have done is divert the attention. Take the resources away and then use it as a way to compel to see if we can force Congress to get pulled into this debate.

Our thing is very, very simple. Again, it is not a funding issue. It is a service issue. We are not getting into that with this particular bill. It is a very simple thing that says: Create a plan for how you do it.

I am glad that the gentleman from New Jersey, who I respect enormously, has been able, Mr. Chair, to touch on the very point that was also made, this idea that somehow we have been unresponsive and starved this agency. Mr. Chairman, \$290 million just sent purposely for this issue, \$290 million.

So in addition to saying to give us a plan, we are saying: Here is \$290 million of focused funding to say this is behind the plan. Tell us how you are going to use it.

This whole thing is a smokescreen on the part of the other side to create the tension when, in fact, we are asking for a very simple thing that we have already funded.

Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1252. An act to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purpose.

S. 2012. An act to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

BAN ON IRS BONUSES UNTIL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY DEVELOPS COMPREHENSIVE CUSTOMER SERVICE STRATEGY

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1030

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, just in response to my friend from the Keystone State, the implementation of the Affordable Care Act is not an IRS slush fund. There are mandates within the Affordable Care Act which necessitate, obviously, the involvement of the IRS agency. So any attempts to make it or create a slush fund in people's minds is totally, totally inaccurate.

That is not the issue. The issue is we have cut \$5 billion. This year we've restored \$290 million. Again, do the math. We have 13,000 less employees. So that means a lot of those 13,000 less employees came to the end, perhaps, of their career, but were never replaced. It had nothing to do with the budget. It was beyond the budget, even, or within the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Seven former IRS Commissioners wrote, and we need to take a look at it because obviously they weren't all Democrats and they weren't all Republicans, but seven former IRS Commissioners have said: "Over the last 50 years, none of us has ever witnessed anything like what has happened to the IRS appropriations over the last 5 years and impact these appropriations reductions are having on our tax system."

The percentage of callers able to reach a live person at the IRS in the 2015 filing season was just 43 percent. The average wait time was 28 minutes. At one point during the filing season, the Taxpayer Protection Program line, which answers calls for victims of identity theft—a growing issue day by day—was not answering 90 percent of the calls.

That is not acceptable to your side. It is certainly not acceptable to our side, but your solution is, by no means, the solution. If you were truly concerned about improving customer service at the IRS, you would fully fund the agency. And we would support that. Penalizing the IRS is misguided and, in the long run, the consequence hurts the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I want to once again actually appreciate the comments that were made by the other side in the entirety of this debate because they really speak to, in essence, what they are trying to do.

And I start again with this effectively unfunded mandate that was put on the IRS by the other side. They talk about funding. They gave them \$1.7 billion of responsibility under the Affordable Care Act, but never a penny to pay for it. As my parents used to say when I was a kid: You should have thought about that when you did it.

Where was the recognition that these responsibilities that you are putting on them, you have got to pay for them?

We have seen costs rise exponentially in so many different factors, but that is the essence of what is being done here. So we are not going to pay for it, but let's create tension and anxiety at the one place where the taxpayers will uprise, because we will stop talking to them. That is the essence of what is being done here.

Mr. Chairman, once again, we are not asking for anything radical in response. In fact, we have already responded quite appropriately by putting \$290 million more into the very issue that is at stake here.

All we are saying is: Come up with a plan. Show us how you are going to do it. Show us how, when 48 million people call you and ask for help with their taxes at a time when they don't have 34 minutes to wait on a phone, to be one of the lucky 30 percent that even get their phone call answered. Do what a number of other agencies already do, give us a plan on how you are going to improve that.

It is that simple. Our purpose isn't to punish diligent IRS employees, but rather to compel management to finally put the taxpayers first and take the need to improve the customer service experience seriously.

Upon learning that this legislation was in development, the IRS reported to the GAO that they have established a team to consider its customer service recommendations. How about that? After 3 years, no response.

The IRS Commissioner himself says service is abysmal. And they say it has been satisfactory up to this point in time. But as soon as this legislation is introduced, we have customer service recommendations and a team being established. I don't think that is a coincidence. Passing the bill into law will ensure that the process continues in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has a duty to oversee the IRS and ensure that it is meeting the needs of American taxpayers. When the IRS fails to meet those needs, it is up to Congress to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, it shall be in order

to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-49. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4890

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BAN ON IRS BONUSES UNTIL IRS DEVELOPS COMPREHENSIVE CUSTOMER SERVICE STRATEGY.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary's delegate, may not pay a bonus, award, or similar cash payment to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary, or the Secretary's delegate, develops and submits to Congress a comprehensive customer service strategy that has been reviewed and approved by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration. Such strategy shall include—

(1) appropriate telephone and correspondence levels of service, which shall be based on service provided by the best in business and customer expectations;

(2) a thorough assessment of which services the Internal Revenue Service can shift to self-service options; and

(3) proposals to improve customer service in the short term (the current and following fiscal year), medium term (approximately three to five fiscal years), and long term (approximately ten fiscal years).

(b) *PROGRESS REPORTS.*—The Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall submit reports to the Congress on the status of its customer service strategy and actions taken to improve customer service. Such reports shall be submitted on a semiannual basis until the comprehensive customer service strategy under subsection (a) is fully implemented.

SEC. 2. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated or made available.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-503. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall be not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-503.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 23, strike "or made available".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical amendment to clarify section 2 of the bill. This section states that no additional funds are authorized or otherwise made available to carry out the requirement of this bill. The language in the amendment makes it abundantly clear that we are not authorizing a new appropriation here.

The IRS needs to create a customer service agency. If they want to claim that they don't have enough money in the budget to be serving the taxpayers with an appropriate topnotch customer service strategy, then we are saying: Give us a plan to do so, and withhold the bonuses until you do so. It is very, very simple.

This amendment makes a technical correction to make our intentions here crystal clear. The IRS doesn't need additional funding to make customer service the top priority when, in fact, it has already been given \$290 million to do just this.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, once again, my friends on the other side of the aisle are cutting off their nose to spite their face: more mandates on the IRS with fewer resources and somehow expecting them to improve services.

As I have said, the IRS is servicing 9 million more people with \$1 billion less. This amendment would only exacerbate that problem. The words of the seven former IRS Commissioners ring out here.

Why don't we just cut congressional office budgets by 17 percent, as we did with the IRS, and then mandate that we improve constituent services or increase our workloads?

That doesn't make any sense either.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-503.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 17, insert the following:

(C) CONSULTATION WITH TAXPAYER ADVOCATE.—In developing the comprehensive customer service strategy pursuant to this section, the Secretary, or the Secretary's delegate, shall consult with the National Taxpayer Advocate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 688, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have a small but, I think, perfecting amendment that I think, whether Republican or Democrat, we can agree on. Because I think as Republicans and Democrats, we may have different perspectives on this equation, but we would agree that money is power and that the IRS has an immense amount of power, given the amount of money that it is, in essence, steward to and controls as money is moved from individuals across this country to the Federal Government.

I think that we would agree that money without a plan is chaos. That is why in the military they have a five-paragraph order. That is why if you think about the business rule, you have a business plan. If you think about sports, you have got a game plan. You need to go through a planning process to effectively use money.

I think we would agree that the government's role is to serve. I think it disturbed a lot of us that the Lincoln Memorial was closed back during the government shutdown. Some people saw that as a way of maximizing inconvenience for folks, as a way of highlighting some rule we agreed or disagreed on as opposed to, again, staying focused on this larger notion of service.

So I applaud the overall work of this bill and what it is about. I think that there is a problem when wait times move up threefold over the last 5 years. I think that there is a problem with dropped calls and infinity holds and all the other things that people have seen come their way as a result of dysfunction at the IRS. We might see different remedies as to how we get there, but I think we would agree on those things.

And so I applaud what is being done with this notion of saying: Let's hold on bonuses. Let's actually come up with a plan as we deal with how this additional \$20 million is dispensed and used within the IRS.

This amendment simply says that as you go in consultation with the Treasury, as you go in consultation with the IG, let's also include the National Taxpayer Advocate there at the IRS. Because I think it is important. You may deal with technology experts, you may deal with phone call experts, you may deal with taxation specialists, but to keep the bull's-eye the ultimate customer out there—and that is the taxpayer.

Too often the taxpayer is indeed the forgotten man or forgotten women in this equation. The idea of consulting

with the National Taxpayers Union as you formulate those plans, again, I think make this a simply perfecting amendment, as you listen to the different constituencies that will be dealt with in coming up with this plan.

I think that perspective is key in holding the taxpayers' viewpoint to be vital in the creation of this plan. That is all the amendment does.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

□ 1045

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, let me just take a moment to say that the National Taxpayer Advocate has a long history of not only working on behalf of taxpayers, but working with the IRS to improve customer service. I think having the National Taxpayer Advocate involved in this process of creating comprehensive service strategy will actually improve the final outcome.

I thank the gentleman for taking his time not only to look at the totality of this bill, but to find a way to improve its implementation with that support.

I support the addition, and I urge others to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, so let's get this amendment straight. This bill would have the IRS work with the National Taxpayer Advocate, in addition to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, as I read it correctly, in coming up with a customer service plan. Sounds good.

However, you forget to mention one thing, Mr. Chairman, because the National Taxpayer Advocate and the Treasury Inspector General Tax Administrator have publicly stated, for the record, that the severe budget cuts enacted by the other side, Mr. Chairman, in Congress have forced the IRS to reduce its workforce, reduce training, reduce technology, and that these steps have weakened the ability to enforce the Nation's tax laws—is that what you are looking for?—and serve taxpayers effectively.

They said it, I didn't. You can't make this stuff up.

So, instead of forcing the IRS to work with the National Taxpayer Advocate, why don't we, in Congress, listen to them, and fund the IRS so it can do its job?

This is the height of misdirection. I am only going by the words you have in this amendment. And I will tell you, they have made a statement very loud and clear to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4890) to impose a ban on the payment of bonuses to employees of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary of the Treasury develops and implements a comprehensive customer service strategy, and, pursuant to House Resolution 688, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 4890 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 3724.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 158, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—260

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Cole
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (GA)
Aguilar	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Cook
Babin	Buchanan	Cooper
Barletta	Buck	Costa
Barr	Bucshon	Costello (PA)
Barton	Burgess	Cramer
Benishek	Byrne	Crawford
Bera	Calvert	Cuellar
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chaffetz	DeFazio
Blackburn	Cicilline	Dent
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Bost	Coffman	DesJarlais
Boustany	Cohen	Diaz-Balart

Dold	Kline	Roby	Lowenthal	Payne	Slaughter	Bridenstine	Guinta	Miller (FL)
Donovan	Knight	Roe (TN)	Lowey	Pelosi	Speier	Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Miller (MI)
Duffy	Kuster	Rogers (AL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)	Brooks (IN)	Hahn	Moolenaar
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rogers (KY)	(NM)	Peterson	Takai	Brownley (CA)	Hanna	Mooney (WV)
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Rohrabacher	Lynch	Pingree	Takano	Buchanan	Hardy	Moulton
Ellmers (NC)	LaMalfa	Rokita	Maloney,	Pocan	Thompson (CA)	Buck	Harper	Mullin
Emmer (MN)	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)	Carolyn	Polis	Thompson (MS)	Bucshon	Harris	Mulvaney
Farenthold	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen	Matsui	Price (NC)	Titus	Burgess	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Roskam	McCollum	Quigley	Tonko	Bustos	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Fleischmann	Lipinski	Ross	McDermott	Rangel	Torres	Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Newhouse
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rothfus	McGovern	Richmond	Tsongas	Byrne	Hensarling	Noem
Flores	Long	Rouzer	McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Nolan
Forbes	Loudermilk	Royce	Meeks	Rush	Veasey	Cárdenas	Hice, Jody B.	Nugent
Fortenberry	Love	Ruiz	Meng	Ryan (OH)	Vela	Carney	Higgins	Nunes
Fox	Lucas	Ruppersberger	Moore	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez	Carter (GA)	Hill	O'Rourke
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Russell	Moulton	T.	Visclosky	Carter (TX)	Himes	Olson
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Salmon	Murphy (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz	Cartwright	Holding	Palazzo
Garrett	MacArthur	Sanford	Nadler	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Palmer
Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Scalise	Napolitano	Schakowsky	Schultz	Chabot	Hudson	Paulsen
Gibson	Marchant	Schrader	Neal	Schiff	Waters, Maxine	Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Pearce
Gohmert	Marino	Schweikert	Nolan	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman	Chu, Judy	Huizenga (MI)	Perlmutter
Goodlatte	Massie	Scott, Austin	Norcross	Scott, David	Welch	Ciicilline	Hultgren	Perry
Gosar	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner	O'Rourke	Serrano	Wilson (FL)	Clawson (FL)	Hunter	Peters
Gowdy	McCaul	Sessions	Pallone	Sherman	Yarmuth	Coffman	Hurd (TX)	Peterson
Graham	McClintock	Shinkus	Pascrell	Sires		Cohen	Hurt (VA)	Pingree
Granger	McHenry	Shuster				Cole	Israel	Pittenger
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Simpson				Collins (GA)	Issa	Pitts
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Sinema	Amodei	Fincher	Sewell (AL)	Collins (NY)	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Smith (MO)	Beyer	Grayson	Smith (TX)	Comstock	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Griffith	McSally	Smith (NE)	Crenshaw	Hunter	Smith (WA)	Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Polis
Grothman	Meadows	Smith (NJ)	Denham	Lujan Grisham	Van Hollen	Connolly	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Guinta	Meehan	Stefanik	Edwards	(NM)		Cook	Jolly	Price (NC)
Guthrie	Messer	Stewart	Fattah	Pompeo		Cooper	Jones	Price, Tom
Hahn	Mica	Stivers				Costa	Jordan	Quigley
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Stutzman				Costello (PA)	Joyce	Ratcliffe
Hardy	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)				Courtney	Kaptur	Reed
Harper	Moolenaar	Thornberry				Cramer	Katko	Reichert
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Tiberi				Crawford	Keating	Renacci
Hartzler	Mullin	Tipton				Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Ribble
Heck (NV)	Mulvaney	Trott				Crowley	Kelly (PA)	Rice (NY)
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Turner				Cuellar	Kilmer	Rice (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer	Upton				Culberson	Kind	Rigell
Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Valadao				Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Roby
Hill	Noem	Wagner				Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Holding	Nugent	Walberg				DeFazio	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Hudson	Nunes	Walden				Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (KY)
Huelskamp	Olson	Walker				DeLauro	Kline	Rohrabacher
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Walorski				DelBene	Knight	Rokita
Hultgren	Palmer	Walters, Mimi				Denham	Kuster	Rooney (FL)
Hurd (TX)	Paulsen	Weber (TX)				Dent	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Hurt (VA)	Pearce	Webster (FL)				DeSantis	LaHood	Roskam
Issa	Perry	Wenstrup				DeSaulnier	LaMalfa	Ross
Jenkins (KS)	Peters	Westerman				DesJarlais	Lamborn	Rothfus
Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Westmoreland				Diaz-Balart	Lance	Rouzer
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Whitfield				Dingell	Langevin	Royce
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Williams				Doggett	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Jolly	Poliquin	Wilson (SC)				Dold	Latta	Ruppersberger
Jones	Posey	Wittman				Donovan	Lawrence	Russell
Jordan	Price, Tom	Womack				Doyle, Michael	Levin	Salmon
Joyce	Ratcliffe	Woodall				F.	Lieu, Ted	Sanford
Katko	Reed	Yoder				Duckworth	Lipinski	Scalise
Kelly (MS)	Reichert	Yoho				Duffy	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Young (AK)				Duncan (SC)	Loeb sack	Schiff
King (IA)	Ribble	Young (IA)				Duncan (TN)	Lofgren	Schrader
King (NY)	Rice (NY)	Young (IN)				Ellmers (NC)	Long	Schweikert
Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin				Emmer (MN)	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Kirkpatrick	Rigell	Zinke				Eshoo	Love	Scott, David
						Esty	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner
						Farenthold	Lowey	Sessions
						Farr	Lucas	Sewell (AL)
						Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Sherman
						Fleischmann	Luján, Ben Ray	Shinkus
						Fleming	(NM)	Shuster
						Flores	Lummis	Simpson
						Forbes	MacArthur	Sinema
						Fortenberry	Maloney,	Smith (MO)
						Foster	Carolyn	Smith (NE)
						Fox	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
						Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Speier
						Frelinghuysen	Marino	Stefanik
						Fudge	Massie	Stewart
						Gabbard	Matsui	Stivers
						Garamendi	McCarthy	Stutzman
						Garrett	McCaul	Swalwell (CA)
						Gibbs	McClintock	Thompson (CA)
						Gibson	McCollum	Thompson (PA)
						Gohmert	McDermott	Thornberry
						Goodlatte	McHenry	Tiberi
						Gosar	McKinley	Tipton
						Gowdy	McMorris	Torres
						Graham	Rodgers	Trott
						Granger	McNerney	Tsongas
						Graves (GA)	McSally	Turner
						Graves (LA)	Meadows	Upton
						Graves (MO)	Meehan	Valadao
						Green, Al	Meeks	Veasey
						Green, Gene	Meng	Vela
						Griffith	Messer	Visclosky
						Grothman	Mica	Wagner

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1110

Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, Thursday, April 21, 2016, I was unable to be present for the first recorded vote of the day. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 162 (on passage of H.R. 4890).

ENSURING INTEGRITY IN THE IRS WORKFORCE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3724) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 78, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—345

Adams	Crowley	Hastings	Abraham	Barton	Blum
Bass	Cummings	Heck (WA)	Aderholt	Benishak	Blumenauer
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Higgins	Aguilar	Bera	Bonamici
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Himes	Allen	Billirakis	Bost
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hinojosa	Amash	Bishop (GA)	Boustany
Blumenauer	Delaney	Honda	Ashford	Bishop (MI)	Boyle, Brendan
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hoyer	Babin	Bishop (UT)	F.
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Huffman	Barletta	Black	Brady (TX)
F.	DeSaulnier	Israel	Barr	Blackburn	Brat
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Jackson Lee			
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Jeffries			
Bustos	Doggett	Johnson (GA)			
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael	Johnson, E. B.			
Capps	F.	Kaptur			
Capuano	Duckworth	Keating			
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kelly (IL)			
Carney	Engel	Kennedy			
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kildee			
Cartwright	Esty	Kilmer			
Castor (FL)	Farr	Kind			
Castro (TX)	Foster	Langevin			
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)			
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Larson (CT)			
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Lawrence			
Clay	Gallego	Lee			
Cleaver	Garamendi	Levin			
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lewis			
Connolly	Green, Gene	Lieu, Ted			
Conyers	Grijalva	Loeb sack			
Courtney	Gutiérrez	Lofgren			

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walterski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—78

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Deutch
Ellison
Engel
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

Hastings
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Lewis
Lynch
McGovern
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan

Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Vargas
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Amodi
Beyer
Edwards
Fattah

Fincher
Grayson
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Pompeo
Smith (TX)
Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1119

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. KEATING changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call Vote No. 163 on H.R. 3724, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-

hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, sponsored by Representative STEVE CHABOT. This bill extends the role of angel investing in assisting start-up businesses to acquire the financing needed to grow, innovate, and create jobs.

The House will also consider H.R. 4901, the Scholarship for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act, sponsored by Representative JASON CHAFFETZ. This bill is essential to improving education outcomes for low-income students in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.J. Res. 88, sponsored by Representative PHIL ROE, which disapproves of the rules submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term “fiduciary.” This ill-advised rule will result in thousands of individuals being dropped by their financial advisers and unable to receive sound financial advice.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information as to the schedule. As I am sure he knows, I will want to ask him some questions about things that are not yet scheduled and, of course, the next week we will take a recess.

□ 1130

As the gentleman knows, the budget was passed out of the Budget Committee last month. We understand, of course, obviously, the Appropriations Committee is proceeding to mark up bills notwithstanding the fact that the budget has not been passed.

We are not sure exactly what the allocations for each subcommittee are going to be because, apparently, there has been no 302(b) allocation, which is the allocation to the 12 subcommittees.

It is going to be hard for us to tell exactly how much money is left if, in fact, appropriations bills are brought to the floor without knowing fully the distribution of funds for both defense and domestic priorities.

First, let me ask the gentleman: Does the gentleman expect the budget to be brought to the floor prior to the bringing of appropriations bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We will continue to work through the budget process, and I will update the Members once there is more information.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the depth of that information.

We do have a serious problem. And I want to tell my friend, the majority leader, as someone who had served on the Appropriations Committee for 23

years, obviously, one of the important facts to know is how much will be allocated for each one of the 12 subcommittees so you can make judgments, as bills come to the floor or as they come to full committee, about whether the funding levels for those are appropriate or whether there ought to be other priorities that ought to be brought to the floor.

I appreciate the gentleman's response. I know that the Speaker has indicated that doing a budget is absolutely the responsible thing to do, that that is the regular order to do, and I know the budget has passed out of the committee. So I am wondering: What is holding the budget up, Mr. Leader? Why aren't we considering it?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and asking again.

As for the schedule, we are not scheduled for next week. We continue to work through. We think the budget is very important. When we have it scheduled, I will notify.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, I suppose, for that additional information.

Of course, it goes without saying that it is not scheduled next week, and we still don't have the knowledge that I think is necessary for us to have before you bring the appropriations bills to the floor. In having said that, I understand the gentleman's answer.

There are three items that I have brought up before, Mr. Leader, that we think are critical items to be brought sooner rather than later that we need to deal with.

First, I want to reiterate what I said last week. I appreciate the majority leader's and I appreciate the Speaker's action and the chairman of the committee, Mr. BISHOP, in working with Treasury and with our side of the aisle to try to get a bill that we can agree on—that can enjoy bipartisan support—that will address the crisis that confronts the American citizens who live in Puerto Rico.

I also want to thank the gentleman—we had a meeting in his office—in that he and I shared the view that we ought to have a bill that is simple and straightforward so that we can forge a bipartisan agreement and get this bill done.

The Speaker has set May 1 as the deadline. It would appear that we are not going to meet that deadline. And we did not meet the March 31 deadline. But I know we had a meeting yesterday with our staffs. It was a positive meeting, and I hope it will lead to a productive meeting as well.

I would like to yield to my friend to see if the gentleman has any comments about where we stand on our moving forward on a bill to address the fiscal crisis in Puerto Rico.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, the gentleman is correct in that we have been working together, especially with the Natural Resources Committee, on the proposal.

I appreciate the gentleman's commitment as well in making sure that we produce a bill that has solid financial footing and no financial bailout, which the work we are doing right now does not.

As the gentleman knows, the discussions are ongoing, and part of the challenge of finishing it is the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department still had some concerns.

I know there were some meetings this week, and I know there were Members on your side of the aisle who did not feel comfortable in moving forward until the Treasury Department had finished some of those negotiations.

But we look forward to getting the bill finished and moving it forward on a bipartisan basis, a bill that has no bailout, but that meets the needs with what is going on in Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I would reiterate what he and I both stated last week, which is that, clearly, this is not a bailout. There is no money contemplated that is going to Puerto Rico, and there is no extension of U.S. credit backing from the United States to Puerto Rico.

What it is, as the gentleman knows, is just setting up a process for a restructuring of debt that everyone knows cannot be paid, and there needs to be some sort of rational way that Puerto Rico can work itself to both repay that which it can repay while, at the same time, maintain the absolutely essential services of education, health care, and public safety for the American citizens who live in Puerto Rico. So I would hope that we would continue to work on that.

Again, the majority leader's staff and my staff, Treasury, and Mr. BISHOP's staff, the leader's staff and Mr. RYAN's staff all have been working towards that end, and I appreciate that.

But I think we all feel a sense of urgency. Even if we could work it out over the weekend or before we end next week, if we could bring it to the floor next week, if we had an agreement, I think that would be a good thing for us to do. I don't know whether it is possible—I hope it is possible—but I look forward to working with the majority leader towards that end.

There are two other items, as you know, that I have mentioned in the past.

Zika. There was a very compelling editorial in The Washington Post today about Zika. The administration has asked for \$1.9 billion to address that crisis, which, clearly, almost every week, the CDC says is a growing one, with more exposure, with more of the United States' mainland being implicated as being at risk.

In addition to that, of course, Ebola continues to be a continuing health challenge both in Africa and in this country, but mainly in Africa. As you know, we appropriated money.

Mr. ROGERS and the Appropriations Committee and the gentleman said: Look, we can take some of that money and move it over to the Zika effort.

The problem with that, Mr. Leader, as I think you have heard me say before, is that Ebola continues to be a crisis.

Is there any expectation that we could bring a supplemental appropriations bill for this emergency that confronts the health of our people here, in Puerto Rico, in the Caribbean, and, frankly, in other parts of the world? Is there any chance of bringing a supplemental to the floor to address both of those?

In addition, Flint continues to be on bottled water because they have not yet been provided with a water system that works for their people.

So those three items, in addition to Puerto Rico, I think are compelling, timely issues for us to address.

Will the gentleman give me any additional information as to when that might occur?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take the opportunity to thank the gentleman for working with us on Zika.

As he knows, I approached him early on to make sure we dealt with this in a bipartisan manner. As to any threat, we want to make sure it is not a partisan issue.

As the gentleman knows, there was somewhere around \$2 billion in unobligated Ebola money. One of the ideas, especially when the administration had requested money, was to have time to go through and ask the question, and many of those questions have not been answered yet.

We wanted to make sure no funding problems would happen. We are proud of the administration for its being able to take our idea and move almost \$600 million into Zika as we go forward. That will take us quite a ways into this fiscal year.

We are continuing to look at and to ask questions. I have a whole list here of questions that have been asked from a standpoint of an updated spending plan from HHS, which still hasn't been planned, of where they go, of what activities will the funds carry out, of how much funding do the agencies anticipate needing in 2016.

I mean, as the gentleman knows, never should we write a blank check, but never should we turn a blind eye to a problem. I am proud of the fact that we have not and that we have responsibly made sure that close to \$600 million is used right now.

We have asked the questions of what we need to go forward. I know the Appropriations Committee is continuing to work on that. We have the appropriations process going through, and that will probably be the ideal time to deal with it and anything going any further because we would have the questions answered and the ability to fund it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me make a couple of observations.

I hear there is some discussion about the appropriations process. As the gentleman well knows, the appropriations process hasn't done too well lately.

Forgetting about who is to blame or who is not to blame, the appropriations process, essentially, has not worked, as the gentleman knows. Of course, last year, as we had done the year before, we passed an omnibus and didn't pass the appropriations bills.

My view is we have an emergency. It is doubtful that appropriations bills are going to get done in time. My own supposition is we are going to have a CR in September.

We have, really, 40 days left between now, I think, and the August break of legislative days. It is going to be problematic, at best, to get appropriations bills done by October 1, much less to respond to an emergency, which is why we believe that a supplemental, really, is called for.

We have two emergencies that are ongoing and a third in Flint, Michigan, and we believe that we ought to respond to those long before the possibility, much less the probability, of the appropriations bills passing this House, the Senate, and being signed by the President.

Does the gentleman have any thoughts on that? Because, if you are contemplating an appropriations process, Mr. Leader, with all due respect, past history would tell us, over the last few years—again, forgetting about who is to blame for it—the appropriations process does not get done in a timely fashion.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the Appropriations Committee has already marked up three bills. The gentleman having served on Appropriations, he also understands that that is where you get a lot of questions answered, that that is where you get a lot of the good information from both sides of the aisle.

There is close to \$600 million for Zika right now. I have the same concern that you have. That is why I am telling the administration and the agencies that it would be very helpful if they would answer the questions needed.

Where would this money go? There are so many from the perspective of: Is Ebola no longer a public health risk? You have \$2 billion, unobligated, sitting in there that we could use.

If we want to solve the Zika problem, I think we should all work together. I am looking for the administration to answer some questions. I think that is the most responsible way to go about solving this problem.

I haven't given up on the appropriations process. I think it is a perfect opportunity, and I would think, for Members on both sides of the aisle, maybe it would give them a little incentive, in knowing the challenges that are out there for the American public, that this is the process that was created. And we could all have input.

One thing that we know, since this majority has taken over, is that we have an open process in appropriations as well; so, anybody can offer an amendment. I think that would be the best place to deal with this.

I do have a very personal compassion in talking about water. I know the situation that happened in Flint. I have lived with water problems in California for quite some time. For the last three Congresses, I have fought very hard to solve that for California.

Unfortunately, the other Chamber has done nothing. I have kids in the Central Valley who do not have water, people who are on bottled water they bring in, people who have portable water, where they have to come in and bring the tanks.

We have lived this for quite some time; so, you will find, on this side of the aisle, someone who is very compassionate about it and who wants to deal with that water issue at the same time as well. I think it would be appropriate.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his concern, which I think is sincere, about California.

Let me say to him that I would certainly be open on this side of the aisle, as, I am sure, my Members would be, to working with him to address those issues.

It is not a question of Flint, per se, but it is a question of some 6,000 to 9,000 children who have been exposed immediately, and it is an emergency now as they are not able to drink the water; they are drinking bottled water.

My point is not that we ought not to address problems in California or, very frankly, in Maryland or in Ohio or in Florida or wherever else they may occur in league with the States and municipalities. Obviously, this is a partnership, not just our responsibility.

□ 1145

I would again reiterate, Zika and Ebola are both emergencies that need to be dealt with now. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct that we ought to know how much is needed, how it is going to be spent, and what effect it will have.

I will tell you that one of my members in the whip meeting this morning, Mr. Leader, said that her understanding from her local health department was that their efforts with respect to Ebola and other infectious diseases are being adversely affected by the fact that that \$589 million, which didn't just come out of the air, was transferred, as you pointed out and as I pointed out, to the Zika response. It was money that was—not obligated—planned to be spent in communities and in other areas to effect a solution to the challenge that confronts us.

So it is not just as if that \$589 million didn't have a purpose when we originally appropriated it. The gentleman supported it and I support it, so

we allocated that money. I know the Appropriations Committee supported it. And I presume, as the gentleman points out, they had hearings to know exactly the answers to the questions. But we will work with you on getting answers to those questions from the administration.

We would urge that, within the next few weeks, we have a supplemental on the floor, having those questions answered and being confident that the money is going to be spent, but knowing full well that people's health is at risk in this country. We have an empathy and a concern about that and want to respond to it. So I would hope that we could move it before the appropriations process because I think, unfortunately, the experience is, under all the parties that have been in control of this House over the years, that sometimes it happens slower than this emergency requires.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 2016, TO MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, April 25, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING KENNETH KANE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kenneth Kane of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, who will be honored at a banquet tomorrow night in State College, Pennsylvania, as an outstanding alumnus of the Penn State University School of Forest Resources.

I have long been impressed by Ken's broad knowledge on forestry policy and regarding our Commonwealth's forests. Kenneth served in a variety of positions for forestry organizations, including as chairman of the Allegheny Society of American Foresters, chairman of the Penn Chapter Association of Consulting Foresters, northeast regional director of the Association of Consulting Foresters of America, and as an adviser to various State-level planning committees, including the Pennsylvania Game Commission and the Pennsylvania Joint Legislative Task Force. When I am looking to draw on expertise regarding Pennsylvania's forests, including the Allegheny National Forest, Ken Kane is one of the first people I turn to.

In addition to that, I am proud to call him my friend. I congratulate him

on this honor, and I look forward to his future work on forestry policy.

NUCLEAR FORCES BUDGET

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the rising cost of our Nation's nuclear forces budget.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that between 2015 and 2024, the administration's plans for nuclear forces will cost us about \$348 billion. That is about \$35 billion a year on our nuclear enterprise. According to the CBO, this is about 5 to 6 percent of the total cost of the administration's plans for our national defense for the next 10 years.

Next week, the House Armed Services Committee will mark up the fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, our military bill, if you will.

One of my main priorities in the committee has been to reduce our Nation's nuclear weapons spending and to reduce our nuclear stockpile. Unfortunately, year after year, the Congress authorizes funding for more weapons while capping the funding that we use to dismantle nuclear weapons. I think it is a far safer world without these nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, rather than spend on the legacy of the cold war, we should be investing in our most important military asset: our men and our women in uniform.

EARTH DAY

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Earth Day.

As an Eagle Scout and a Scoutmaster for many years, I know firsthand why we must all work to strengthen conservation programs and other policies that promote public health, protect our environment, and keep our air and waterways clean. I care deeply about protecting our environment, and I am committed to preserving the outdoors.

The 10th Congressional District of Illinois borders one of the Nation's greatest treasures, Lake Michigan, which provides miles of beaches, natural habitat, recreation for millions across the Midwest, and drinking water to millions of Americans. That is why I am a strong supporter of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and a cosponsor of legislation to ensure that this vital program is reauthorized and funded at robust levels.

I have also introduced the Great Lakes Water Protection Act, which will stop sewage dumping in the Great Lakes and provide clean water for future generations.

In commemoration of Earth Day, I encourage all of my colleagues to join

me and to take some time to appreciate the natural beauty of their communities and to work together to preserve our environment for future generations.

And that is just the way it is.

HARRIET TUBMAN \$20 BILL

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Secretary of the Treasury Lew announced that for the first time U.S. paper currency will feature portraits of great American women. I am very proud that a Maryland native, an abolition hero, Harriet Tubman, was selected to be the new face on the \$20 bill.

Born into slavery on Maryland's eastern shore, she escaped to freedom but returned to rescue her family members. It was dangerous and could easily have cost Tubman her life or her freedom.

After rescuing her family, she kept coming back for others who sought freedom, using the alias, Moses. How appropriate. She brought dozens of people out of slavery, never once losing a passenger on her Underground Railroad route.

During the Civil War, she was an agent for the Union. In the decades following the war, she was active in the movement for women's suffrage.

I can think of no one more suited to be honored with a portrait on the \$20 bill. I am also pleased that other women will be featured on our currency.

SAN JACINTO DAY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the marshy plains where the San Jacinto River meets Buffalo Bayou, now near Houston, General Sam Houston and his volunteer Army of Texians—men from most States and several countries, including Mexico, England, and Germany—faced the invading army under dictator Santa Anna of Mexico. Texas was fighting for independence from Mexico because Mexico had abolished its democracy and became an oppressive dictatorship.

It was the afternoon of April 21, 1836—180 years ago today. The Texian volunteers, although outnumbered 2-1, caught the enemy literally by surprise. On that hot afternoon, General Sam, with his Tejano Cavalry protecting the flank, charged the invaders with the battle cry: Remember the Alamo. Remember Goliad.

In 18 minutes, the battle was over. Half of the enemy were killed, and the other half were captured. On that day, Texas gained freedom and independence.

Sam Houston became President of the Republic of Texas. Texas was an

independent country for 9 years and then joined the United States.

Mr. Speaker, our past has allowed us to have today's freedom. We thank those Texian freedom fighters, on April 21, 1836, San Jacinto Day, for their bold sacrifices, for choosing freedom over tyranny and creating Texas.

And that is just the way it is.

HOUSTON FLOOD VICTIMS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago in Harris County, in Houston, and in my congressional district and many other places, again, the State of Texas experienced a terrible rain. It was not a hurricane and it was not a tornado, but it was a downpouring of 20 inches-plus of rain. Our bayous overran, people were standing on furniture, babies had to be rescued, and people died.

Today, I want to call the names of seven people who died untimely in this terrible, terrible storm. Next week, I will ask my colleagues to stand with me for a minute of silence, but I wanted in this week to call their names. They were mothers and fathers, truck drivers, mechanical engineers, teachers. They were Americans, they were Houstonians, they were Texans, and, unfortunately, they died.

The government must work better to ensure that there are flashing lights on underpasses and toward many other solutions. We look forward to the declaration of disaster to help the people remaining.

My sympathy to their families: German Antonio Franco, Claudia Melgar, Sunita Vikas Malhara, Pedro Rascon Morales, Charles Edward Odom, Suresh Kumar Talluri, Teri White Rodriguez.

Mr. Speaker, may they rest in piece. God bless their families in this terrible, terrible time.

RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN BANGLADESH

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, in Bangladesh, the horrendous, brutal street assassinations of members of minority religions, secularists, and atheists violate every single value that we hold dear.

Just 2 weeks ago, 28-year-old Nazimuddin Samad was hacked to death in Dhaka, Bangladesh, after speaking out against the persecution of religious minorities on social media.

Evelyn Beatrice Hall, the late British author, wrote: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

In Bangladesh, discrimination and deadly violence against atheists, secularists, Hindus, Buddhists, and other religious minorities have unfortunately become a regular occurrence.

This underscores the absolute necessity of not only defeating this global wave of intolerance, but standing up and fighting for the right of others to freely express their views regardless of whether you agree with those views or not.

I introduced H. Res. 396 to call on the Government of Bangladesh to protect the rights of all of its religious minorities, including Christians, Hindus, atheists, and others. They have a responsibility to uphold the principles of its secular constitution, including freedom of religion and freedom of expression, and take action against this senseless violence.

I encourage my colleagues to take action and support this resolution's passage.

REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in October of this year, the Republic of Georgia will hold elections. More than just an election to determine its national leadership, this election will likely determine whether the Republic of Georgia remains a semi-free country that will continue on a path to self-determination or whether it will succumb to corruption, Russian oligarch influence, and Russian domination.

Georgia has a long history of fighting to protect its identity against evil tyrants, bullying neighbors, corrupted officials, and outright invasion. A small but important nation with its distinct language and people, Georgian territory forms a vital land bridge between Eastern Europe and West Asia that is nestled on the Black Sea. With the exception of her neighbor Armenia, much of her history has been fighting for survival against her neighbors wanting to force her into Russian, Turkish, or Persian domination.

Since Georgia's reassertion of independence from her Russian masters in 1991, her struggle has not been easy. Balanced between a crumbling Soviet Union and internal unrest, Georgia emerged from several years of civil strife to defend her independence. Georgia saw her first President, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, ousted by Russian-backed leaders, such as Eduard Shevardnadze. During attempts to restore elected government, President Gamsakhurdia later would lose his life in still mysterious circumstances.

After a period of domination by Russian-backed forces and political leaders, the nascent Republic of Georgia strove for great reforms in the Rose Revolution of 2003, finally breaking her chains and setting a path toward self-determination. The United States and the international community embraced

this effort, and global monitors affirmed the legitimate vote of the people that exposed the corruption of the election results.

□ 1200

Shevardnadze's government attempted to ignore the true results, but the Georgian people had a different plan and peacefully forced Shevardnadze to succumb to the will of the people as they stormed the parliament with roses. It was one of the most inspirational episodes of freedom in world history.

Since then, Georgia has enjoyed a period of self-determination, Western engagement, human rights improvements, and trade. This has not been without cost. Separatists in the Georgian districts of Ossetia and Abkhazia, encouraged by Moscow, cast the Republic of Georgia into turmoil. Russia used this unrest as pretext to invade Georgia and still occupies these territories while denouncing earlier agreements to close Russian bases on Georgia's Black Sea coast.

Still, President Mikheil Saakashvili was able to take his rightful place as the duly elected President of Georgia, and his reforms brought Georgia from a backward status in the world to a much improved financial structure, with marked increases in economic growth and foreign investment.

For all of Georgia's struggles, for all of her self-determination, outside neighbors once again are vying to make Georgia subservient to their wishes. Russia has been stung by free peoples in independent states that she once dominated in the Soviet era that now choose instead to preserve their language, culture, history, and restore their freedom.

Russia, for its part, has done everything in its power to force these peoples back into a serf status. Whether in Crimea, Ukraine, the Baltic States, or Georgia, the pattern has been the same.

Russia's playbook starts with flooding opposition groups with cash from oligarchs loyal to Moscow. Separatists are courted in areas with some Russian ethnicity and then encouraged to foment division against these struggling republics, demanding their rights for Russian peoples in these territories.

Russia then aids militias to create violence that strains the local political and law enforcement structure, causing the people living there to wish for anything—even the bad old days—to somehow restore order.

Then national political parties are infiltrated and flushed with oligarch cash and promises of power as they convert legitimate parliaments into calls for pro-Moscow governance that, in essence, become nothing more than the old Soviet Socialist structure ruled by Moscow.

In Georgia, it has been no different. Despite Georgia casting off outside invaders and attempting to push off the chains of Russia in the early 1800s or in

1918 or in 1991, Russia somehow feels it is her right to treat Georgians as a subclass of human beings that only exist to serve the interests of Moscow and her territory should only merely be a transitway for Russian interests.

After the successful removal of Russian chains in the Rose Revolution in 2003, Russia has continually bullied Georgia's political system, fomented unrest in Abkhazia and Ossetia, invaded Georgia, and violated her agreement to withdraw from bases in Georgian territory. Amazingly, through all of this, Georgia has remained resolute.

So, in classic form, Russia has moved to infiltrate the political process in the hopes of creating its own pro-Moscow government in the Georgian capital to hand them everything on a silver political platter.

Chief among the funding efforts and political infiltration is oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili, a close ally of Vladimir Putin. The aim is to rig votes along the same lines as was attempted in 2003 by buying votes, punishing political opponents, using Georgia's own administrative and political resources to influence the elections while using Georgian special forces to influence the outcomes.

Combined with the full privatization of the election commissions, who one source estimates is now 98 percent controlled by Ivanishvili, the Georgian people face an alarming prospect in their right to free elections in October of this year.

Faced with such bullying, the Georgian people are looking to the world for support. It is somehow fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this Saturday marks St. George's Day in world history.

St. George, the Christian martyr and mythical slayer of dragons, is the namesake from whom the country of Georgia takes its name, according to some legends.

The Georgian people are willing to slay this political dragon and stand for their freedom as they have before, but they need our help.

We can ignore their pleas—after all, most Americans don't even know where Georgia is on the map—or we can give them a megaphone to shout their message, and the message is this: They wish to remain free.

Here are some simple steps that we, in our country, can take: We call on the President of the United States to assist in monitoring of this fall's election processes in Georgia, as we once assisted them in the pivotal 2003 elections.

We call upon the Georgian electoral commissions to be restored to representative membership to counter the private buyout being conducted by Moscow and their proxy, oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili.

We call upon the United States Department of Treasury and Western banks to freeze the assets of Ivanishvili for violations as an illegal arms trader.

We call upon the State Department to flag Georgian officials and business

leaders who are discovered to be complicit in tampering with free elections to have their visas revoked and their assets frozen.

We also call upon Western journalists in our free press to give the Georgian people a chance to have their story heard by investigating and covering the remaining few months of what could be the last free months of a Republic of Georgia.

Finally, we call upon the self-determined, free, and resolute people of Georgia to stand in the spirit of St. George.

Hold your head high, grasp the lance, and pierce the attacking dragon. You have been threatened before. By your commitment, as in 2003, you can show the world again that freedom will not succumb to corruption and intimidation.

The people of Georgia should also know the God of the universe does not slumber. We, the people of the United States, join with the people of Georgia in our prayers for your freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

THE WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I so much appreciate my colleague and friend talking about the Georgia election. We should be encouraging fair elections everywhere and, when they are not fair, calling those to account.

Not that we are the policemen of the world, but it becomes so much more unfortunate when you have a nation like Egypt that gets pushed into elections before they are ready, the Muslim Brotherhood takes over the country, as in Egypt when Morsi became President.

He began shredding the Constitution and taking more and more power as it happened in Venezuela with Chavez and other countries. He had taken a lesson: This is the way you do it. You get elected, and then you start seizing more and more power.

To the credit of the Egyptian people, their story in recent years is the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of the world. It wasn't entirely peaceful because of the violence of the Muslim Brotherhood.

They want a world caliphate, and they want to start with something resembling the old Ottoman Empire, that caliphate that came around North Africa and on around the Mediterranean, and they need Egypt in order to make the beginning of the caliphate work.

And so they were quite happy when radical Islam, Muslim Brotherhood, took over Egypt through Morsi. But when the Egyptian people, a third of the population, basically—30 million or so of the 90 million there in the nation of Egypt—rose up together, yes, you had Muslims marching with Christians.

The Coptic Christian Pope himself has told me more than once how moving it was to have Muslims and Christians and Jews and secularists walking together through the streets in Egypt demanding an end to radical Islamic control, demanding that the President, who was constantly violating the Constitution, be removed.

The Coptic Pope told me that it was moving when Muslims, who just wanted peace in Egypt—they didn't want radical Islamic control—would come up to him and apologize for the way that Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood and radical Islamists were acting.

And, yes, among Muslims, they are able to recognize that there is a part of Islam—the radical Islamists—that they don't like, but it is a part of Islam.

When the administration in this country tells the world that there is no such thing as radical Islam, then they are demeaning and degrading those courageous Muslims who stand up and say: We need to stop radical Islam within Muslims, within the Islamic movement. They actually do damage to the people who want to live in peace.

So we are grateful to the people of Egypt for stopping the caliphate before it could be really set in concrete around North Africa and, of course, Syria, all the way around. They want to get back to the old Ottoman Empire and spread and cover the world under the caliphate.

It is really most interesting. We have a President who went to elementary school in Muslim school and was trained in Islam in elementary school, and that is the main part of his training on Islam. Because, as we know, he sat under Jeremiah Wright's teaching in church for 20 years or so.

So the basic teaching on Islam was in elementary school, whereas there is the ultimate world expert on what is or is not Islam that most of the world recognizes.

They don't down the street here, down Pennsylvania Avenue. They don't at the State Department under Secretary Kerry. But most of the world recognizes that a man who got degrees, including his doctor of philosophy, his Ph.D., in Islamic studies from the University of Baghdad, is an expert on Islam.

He says radical Islam is Islam. He didn't just get a little elementary school training on Islam. He studied Islam his whole life, has a Ph.D. in Islamic studies, and has continued to pour himself into study of the Koran, and he happens to be the head of the Islamic State.

□ 1215

It would seem that if somebody who spent his life studying—rather than just studying Islam in elementary school—says the Islamic State is truly Islam, perhaps the so-called experts in our State Department and our White House ought to listen to that and take notice as well that perhaps maybe it is not as they have been saying, that it is

not Islam. It is Islam, but it is a part of Islam, the radical Islamists, and we should be standing against it.

So, again, the Iran treaty clearly is a treaty. It needs to be called for what it is: a treaty. And we need to have people in the Senate with courage to step up and say we need a vote on the Iran treaty, because it is a treaty. The Corker bill doesn't apply because it is a treaty. Take the vote. Two-thirds will not vote for it. It will not be confirmed. Then we can call the Iran treaty at an end, because it never was properly agreed to.

But in the meantime, since this administration put so much of what credibility it has on the table and at risk by backing the Iran deal, Iran—it may be the run-in leaders, their radical Islamic leaders, want to take over the world. They may be crazy in that regard, but they are very intelligent. You can be crazy and still be highly intelligent. That is how you can be crazy enough to fly a plane into a building and kill thousands of innocent people, but you are intelligent enough to have your engineers look at the plans and figure out what kind of load it would take to bring down a building like the World Trade Center.

An article by Joel Pollak from last year—this is last year—and he says: "In his State of the Union address" last year, "President Barack Obama claimed: 'Our diplomacy is at work with respect to Iran, where, for the first time in a decade, we've halted the progress of its nuclear program and reduced its stockpile of nuclear material. Between now and this spring, we have a chance to negotiate a comprehensive agreement that prevents a nuclear-armed Iran; secures America and our allies, including Israel; while avoiding yet another Middle East conflict.'"

Mr. Pollak's article says: "None of that is true. The chances of an agreement have dropped sharply, and even the most optimistic analysts do not expect a deal that 'prevents a nuclear-armed Iran,' but only one that puts nuclear 'breakout' out of reach for a while. Most important of all, we have not 'halted the progress' of Iran's nuclear program. Earlier this month, the Tehran regime announced that it was building two new reactors, and is thought to be behind a suspected facility planned in Syria as well."

"In a lengthy essay in *Commentary* magazine, the invaluable Omri Ceren summarizes the history of President Obama's appeasement of the Iranian's, from the first failed 'suckers deal,' as the French called it, through the new veto threats against congressional sanctions."

"The scale of the Obama administration's incompetence is simply daunting. Far from rallying international unity against Iran, President Obama has destroyed it by giving away global demands decades in the making."

"Suddenly, the reason for . . . invitation to Israeli Prime Minister Ben-

jamin Netanyahu to Congress—without consultation from the White House—becomes clear . . . it is not the pro-Israel nature of Congress that drove the Bibi"—Netanyahu—"invitation. It is the fact that Obama"—

Well, it says he misrepresented things, but that is this article.

But it goes on to point out that "there at least five ways in which Iran has explicitly violated the interim agreement" and spells those out.

This is over a year old. They have never stopped violating the agreement—not the interim agreement—they were violating it, the executive agreement that this President entered with Iran.

They so much sank their reputation into the Iran treaty that has not been ratified that these constant violations by Iran have the administration defending Iran, sending them money, covering for Iran, making excuses for Iran.

This article was from less than a year ago by Cory Bennett from *The Hill*: "A diplomatic deal with Iran to limit its nuclear program could inadvertently jumpstart the country's cyber warfare efforts."

"Experts say Tehran might use the economic sanctions relief from the nuclear pact to buttress its growing cyber program, which has already infiltrated critical networks in over a dozen countries, including the U.S."

So the article goes on to point out: "We are in a lose-lose situation."

It is clear to most of us that the Iranian agreement was a huge mistake. They are the largest state supporters of terrorism in the world, and this administration is ongoing right now in giving billions and billions of dollars.

And though the Iranian leaders have lied about so many things, when they say that the money that President Obama gives to them, which they don't currently have—the \$100 billion to \$150 billion in the first year, perhaps \$100 billion or so each year after that; it remains to be seen—their Iranian leaders say:

We are going to be able to fund more terrorist organizations.

That is a statement we should take seriously. That is something that we should believe when they tell us these things.

So the President is giving them the money. This article says this week that, of the \$3 billion that was recently provided to Iran, this administration can't really tell if they have used it to support additional terrorism or not.

But this article that was written in May of last year that the Iran deal could help fund Iran's cyber war, I bring that up now—it is from May 10 of last year from Mr. Bennett—because it was just in the last 4 or 5 months that John Hayward wrote the article: "Iran Hacks State Department Social Media Accounts."

We know they have hacked a New York dam Web site. They have explored defenses of the United States Government's Internet.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to look back and see that, wow, in May of last year, there were reporters that were warning that this deal with Iran may help them in their cyber warfare against us greater than we even know. Then we find out that this administration put a hold on charges against the Iranians that hacked into our government system until after the deal was made so that people didn't raise more of a fuss to try to stop the Iranian treaty.

Well, it is still not too late. The Senate could go ahead and take a vote. We know that HARRY REID had said:

Gee, there are some low-level confirmations that are so important to the country, we are going to set aside the cloture rule. It only takes 51 votes to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that this Iranian treaty—I keep saying it because it is so critical to the world and to any chance at a semblance of world peace—has to be stopped because it is enriching the largest supporter of terrorism in the world.

The Iranian leaders have made clear to the Iranian people that they have no intention of being bound by any agreement with President Obama, John Kerry, or the people here in the U.S. They are still going to do what they want to.

So all the Senate has to do is take a vote—51 votes; there are plenty of Republicans to do that—and they might just get some Democrats that are too afraid to be seen as supportive of Iran and this nuclear deal that they may get some Democrat votes. Vote with 51 votes to set aside the cloture rule so you can bring treaty to the floor, have a vote on confirmation—it won't get the two-thirds—and then you would have all kinds of people that should have standing to go into Federal court and put a stop to the billions of dollars that this administration is releasing illegally to Iran. That is, funding—this administration says they know not what—it could be terrorism, they are not sure. I would submit they would—Iran would be supporting terrorism.

But here are five things that the article pointed out that they were—even a year ago—breaking the interim agreement: “Trying to buy equipment for plutonium reactor at Arak, breaking commitment to suspend work. The Obama administration actually complained about the purchases to the U.N. Security Council, even as it told the world that Iran had ‘lived up to its end of the bargain.’”

They are “feeding uranium hexafluoride gas into a plant where it had agreed to suspend nuclear enrichment. The Institute for Science and International Security noted that Iran had begun enrichment at the Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant at Natanz. It notified the Obama administration, which complained to the Iranians, which then claimed to have stop the enrichment activity.”

Three: “Withholding camera footage of nuclear facilities, defying the Inter-

national Atomic Energy Agency. A leading International Atomic Energy Agency official recently said the agency was ‘not in a position to provide credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran’ . . . The interim deal was to provide surveillance footage of Iranian nuclear facilities, but Iran has only provided what it wants to reveal.”

And that is consistent with what STEVE KING and I and a couple of other Members were told by the IAEA inspectors who were in charge of inspecting Iran, that they can only go by what they are given. They are not given access to military facilities. They are not being given this footage.

I am very proud to yield to my dear friend from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), a proud graduate of MIT on the floor.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

This is a very interesting topic that you are speaking on, and I have never had the chance on the floor to explain my feelings on this vote nor the reason why I voted as I did on the Iran bill. So I appreciate the opportunity to say a little bit about this.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Texas is basically qualifying the Iran deal as a treaty, and I agree with that position. In fact, I believe I was the only Congressman to vote “present” on that bill. And the reason that I did vote “present”—I just wanted a chance to clarify this—is that I felt that it was a treaty.

I know a lot of us felt that way and we had different ways of dealing with that vote, but I voted “present” to indicate it was a treaty and that it really shouldn't have even been here in the House of Representatives.

□ 1230

According to the Constitution, only the Senate shall agree to the treaties, and not the House. We shouldn't really have a say in that. So I just wanted the opportunity, and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas giving me this opportunity, to explain the reason that I voted “present.” I think it was only the second time since I have been in Congress, and it was for a constitutional reason. I felt strongly that was a treaty.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for this opportunity.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would hang on for a moment, I voted for the bill, but I did not feel like it adequately dealt with the issue that my friend from Kentucky raised, but I completely respect that position.

Since the gentleman from Kentucky and I have had a lot of discussions about Iran and the Iranian treaty and his feelings, I have always felt that his vote, “present,” made eminent sense, was consistent with our position.

Really, the vote on what we took didn't really matter so much as the point that the gentleman has just

made. This is a treaty. The Senate needs to vote on it. Our vote, though nice, was not particularly relevant to the fact that it is a treaty.

I would like to ask, if the gentleman would yield for a question, because I saw that there was a handsome young man in a blue shirt that came in with him, and wondered if he might identify who has accompanied him onto the floor.

Mr. MASSIE. As the gentleman from Texas knows, we are allowed to bring younger constituents and visitors, and we have a visitor from Kentucky; that is true. His name is Joe.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thought perhaps he might be from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. His name is Joe.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is wonderful. He looks quite comfortable here on the floor, looks like he would be a good fit some day.

I thank my friend for making that point.

The vote that we took last year pointed out that the Iranians had not complied; the administration had not complied, as I recall, with the requirements to provide proper information.

But the gentleman from Kentucky is exactly right. The real issue was a vote in the Senate on it being a treaty. The Senate has not yet voted on the Iranian treaty as a treaty, and if they would do that, when it didn't get the two-thirds votes, then we could stop the outrage of sending billions of dollars to a country that has a massive amount of American, precious American blood on its hands because of the way in which they have funded terrorism.

They were the largest provider of IEDs when Americans were fighting for Muslim freedom in Iraq, and yet Iran continued to build and furnish IEDs. It needs to be dealt with. People are suffering in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned Egypt, and what a great day for world history when a third of the population rose up, 30 million people that had never risen up in the history of the world, in peaceful demonstration, despite the Muslim Brotherhood's violence to try to make it appear otherwise. They had never risen up like those people did in Egypt. They are to be commended.

I would humbly submit that if this administration would help Egypt and be the friend to Egypt that it is being in helping Iran and providing money to Iran, then the world would be a far better place than it is with all the help that this administration is providing to Iran.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the ultimate result of the Clinton, Wendy Sherman deal with North Korea, in which, in essence, the Clinton administration says: Hey, we will give you nuclear—we will let you have nuclear power. We will give you what you need to have if you will just sign and say you won't ever use it to develop nukes.

And then, big shocker for some in the Democratic administration—it wasn't

to most of us that were watching from afar in different places in the United States—North Korea lied. They did use what we provided to create nuclear weapons, and now the world is a much less safe place.

So I have no doubt that someday, maybe, some Iranian will kill me; but somebody will be here on the floor, if the Capitol still exists, and will point out that this deal that Obama and Kerry and Wendy Sherman did with Iran, in allowing them to move forward with nuclear activity, providing them with \$100 billion or so to start off, hundreds of billions in the future, that they ended up lying when they said they agreed, initially, to the agreement—even though they have said publicly: We are not going to abide by it—that they ended up using results from the Obama administration's treaty to develop nuclear weapons, and that, just like the Clinton-Albright-Sherman deal with North Korea, the Obama-Kerry-Sherman deal with Iran has resulted in Iran having nukes sooner than they would have otherwise, despite the promises previously by the Obama administration to prevent Iran from having nukes. Actually, they helped them get the nukes.

NORTH CAROLINA'S PASSAGE OF HOUSE BILL 2

Mr. GOHMERT. I want to turn to one other subject that has been very controversial—North Carolina has gotten a bad rap—and this article from ABC News, "North Carolina's Controversial 'Anti-LGBT' Bill Explained."

The article says: "Several civil rights groups and LGBTQ advocates are organizing a rally tonight in Raleigh"—this is from March 24 of this year—"North Carolina, to protest the State's controversial passage of its House Bill 2, which critics have called 'the most anti-LGBT bill in the country.'"

The article says: "Here's everything you need to know about the bill, also known as The Public Facilities Privacy and Security Act, which was signed into law by Governor Pat McCrory on Wednesday.

"What does it do?

"House Bill 2 declares that State law overrides all local ordinances concerning wages, employment, and public accommodations."

"Thus, the law now bars local municipalities from creating their own rules prohibiting discrimination in public places based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Though North Carolina does have a statewide nondiscrimination law, it does not include specific protections for LGBTQ people."

We keep adding letters, you know. We kept adding letters until we got to LGBT, and now we have added Q.

"The law also directs all public schools, government agencies, and public college campuses to require that multiple-occupancy bathrooms and changing facilities, such as locker rooms, be designated for use only by people based on their 'biological sex' stated on their birth certificate.

Transgender people can use the bathrooms and changing facilities that correspond to their gender identity only if they get the biological sex on their birth certificate changed."

"Under the law, public institutions can still offer single-occupancy facilities."

And nobody has a problem with that. If you have got a single bathroom facility that has just got one facility for going to the bathroom, that is fine. It can be for whoever needs to use it.

But they are saying, as has been consistent with the history of the world for most of the world's existence, that if you, according to documentation, are a female, you use the female restroom when it is for multiple people's use at the same time; and if, by documentation, you are a male, you use the male facilities.

It has really been shocking to see how many people, including singers and entertainers and different groups—I understand Target now wants to make sure that boys can use girls restrooms as they please.

But it has been amazing that such people have been demanding that we have to let boys who want to go in little girls bathrooms go in there. If a man wants to go in a little girls bathroom, according to the big popular movement now, for heaven's sake, let's let the man go in the little girls bathroom.

North Carolina has taken action consistent with the position of the world since the world began. If you are going to have a multiple-use restroom, normally, you have a female go to a female multiuse restroom, a male go to a male multiuse restroom.

This article goes on. It says: "Republican lawmakers, who make up the majority of North Carolina's General Assembly, publicly unveiled the language of the bill Wednesday morning."

It goes on and talks about its passage: "In less than 12 hours"—I am talking about after its passage—"the bill was approved by the house and senate"—or after it was brought forward, the bill was passed, signed by the Governor.

Lawmakers in the House voted 83-25 to pass the bill. The Senate approved the bill, 32-0 after Democrats, who make up the minority, walked out of the Chamber in protest.

Obviously, they want men to go to little girls restrooms, too.

"Republicans and allies supporting the bill argued that it was necessary to protect the safety of women and children from 'radical' action by Charlotte."

"Critics of Charlotte's ordinance said it could have allowed men who may be sexual offenders to enter a woman's restroom or locker room by claiming a transgender identity."

Well, critics of the Charlotte ordinance is what the article says, but actually, that is not just a claim; that is a fact.

Under what North Carolina was objecting to, if someone who is a sexual

offender has decided he wants to go in and meddle in a little girls restroom where he has no business, people like the entertainer that doesn't want to go to North Carolina, they are saying, by golly, you have got to let that man go in that little girls restroom.

What has happened to the sense that used to be such a prominent part of this country?

I mean, there was a very intelligent man on Fox News, Bill O'Reilly, who actually asked a lawyer on a panel with him on the show: So they passed this law. They don't want men going into the women's restroom, basically, was the crux of it, or boys going in where little girls go. He asked the question, actually: Who are they trying to protect?

I couldn't believe that we have come to the point where an intelligent person would have to ask such a stupid question. Whether you agree or disagree with what North Carolina did, whom they were trying to protect, it is almost rhetorical. Clearly, whether you agree or disagree, they were trying to protect the little girls.

□ 1245

It is shocking that anybody would have to ask such a question: Gee, whom are they trying to protect by saying men can't go into girls' restrooms? Incredible. The outrage aimed at North Carolina has just been incredible.

I see an article today by Ryan Lovelace from the Washington Examiner: Trump slams North Carolina bathroom law, says state should "leave it the way it is."

The way, apparently, Charlotte was going to have it was that men could go in little girls' restrooms. Of course, sexual predators who are male, all they have to do is say they are transgender and they get to go in the little girls' restrooms and wreak the havoc that made them a sexual predator.

Whom are they trying to protect in North Carolina? They are trying to protect innocent kids who cannot protect themselves. They count on adults to keep them from harm. It is incredible that people are outraged at North Carolina.

Anyone who has children who are female, do you really want men to say: I am transgender and get to go in where your little girl is going to the bathroom, where you can't go because you are not transgender? You are the girl's father.

This article says "What Do Proponents of the Bill Argue?" It says: "Republicans and allies supporting the bill argued that it was necessary to protect the safety of women and children from 'radical' action by Charlotte."

"John Rustin, president of the North Carolina Family Policy Council, testified before the Senate, saying that the Charlotte ordinance 'means men could enter women restrooms and locker rooms—placing the privacy, safety, and

dignity of women and the elderly at great risk.”

Parenthetically, I noticed an article in recent days, last week, that indicated that one of the leading colleges in pushing for transgender restrooms has had a problem—and it has come up a couple of times—where men would come in where women were showering, go into the restroom and use their cell phone, hold it up over the stall so they can film or take pictures of the female who was trying to have some privacy in a very personal act of showering or going to the bathroom.

What is wrong with saying: Do you know what? When it comes to going to the restroom, females will go to female, males will go to male, and, look, if you want to have a single facility for one person at a time to use or families to use to change diapers or whatever, those are really handy? Those are very helpful. My wife and I have used them ourselves raising girls. It is a handy thing to have.

But why condemn North Carolina when they are just trying to protect the privacy of girls? It has already been shown that, if you give guys a chance to say: I am transgender, and I can get to go in and film a girl in a shower, there will be people that do that.

Why not let the transgender LGBTQ+—whatever the initials are—let them have their activities where they don't impose upon the privacy of someone who wants to go to the restroom or shower without someone from the opposite sex being there with them?

Governor McCrory wrote this statement: “The basic expectation of privacy in the most personal of settings, a restroom or locker room, for each gender was violated by government overreach and intrusion by the mayor and city council of Charlotte . . . As a result, I have signed legislation passed by a bipartisan majority to stop this breach of basic privacy and etiquette which was to go into effect April 1.”

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that I understand Target may now be changing their restrooms. I will have to double-check because, if they are going to be having women come to men's restrooms, I won't be going to Target to shop unless and until that changes.

Usually, Target is great. They have the restroom right there where you go in the door to the store, normally. You don't have to go clear to the back of the store. It is a handy thing.

If you have to go shopping, it is handy, but not anymore. Anybody that wants to go to the restroom and have privacy from the opposite sex may need to shop elsewhere. We will have to look at what they have actually done.

Anyway, this article seems to make the point that it is not such a crazy thing that North Carolina has done, and that is why for 99.999 percent of human history, since civilization exists since we got past the caveman era, when there have been public restrooms,

you recognize there is a difference between males and females.

Some day it will be written in the “Rise and Fall of the United States” that the greatest, freest, and most powerful country in the history of the world showed symptoms of insanity when it reached the pinnacle of its greatness and success—and this will be one of the symptoms that was written about—that they thought they were so much smarter than civilization for most of our history of the world that a difference was recognized between men and women for purposes of facilities. It is a sad day for the country.

Now, I see this article from yesterday that Curt Schilling, an ESPN analyst, was fired over what they deemed as an offensive social media post. Here is what Schilling said:

The post showed an overweight man wearing a wig and women's clothing with parts of the T-shirt cut out to expose his chest. It says, “Let him into the restroom with your daughter or else you are a narrow-minded, judgmental, unloving racist bigot who needs to die.”

Apparently, this kind of thing offends ESPN. Although at one time their job was covering sports, now their job is being social managers, apparently, in making sure that, if men want to go to little girls' restrooms, then we let the men go to little girls' restrooms.

This article from yesterday talking about Target stores says: “Target says transgender customers may use the bathroom of the gender with which they identify.”

How about that. Et tu, Target?

So here we are at the place in our history where insanity in the name of political correctness rules the day, common sense is no longer common, and to the point that the current leader in the Republican campaign for President even says that North Carolina should not have taken action that, in essence, says men—which would include sexual predators—should not be allowed to go in women's restrooms. He wanted it left like it was.

So if Charlotte wants to say that, if you are a man and you are a sexual predator and you say you are transgender and want to go into the restroom where little girls are, go ahead.

That is the position of the leading Republican candidate? I don't know. Hopefully, that will be another one of the positions he will change.

But, in the meantime, we need to get common sense back in charge in America while we are still the great country we have been.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Members are reminded not to make reference to guests on the floor of the House.

EXPENDITURES BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 676, 113TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 676 of the 113th Congress, as continued by section 3(f)(2) of H. Res. 5 of the 114th Congress, I write with the following enclosure which is a statement of the aggregate amount expended on outside counsel and other experts on any civil action authorized by H. Res. 676.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER,
Chairman.

AGGREGATE AMOUNT EXPENDED ON OUTSIDE COUNSEL OR OTHER EXPERTS

[H. Res. 676]

July 1–September 30, 2014	\$0.00
October 1–December 31, 2014	42,875.00
January 1–March 31, 2015	50,000.00
April 1, 2015–June 30, 2015	29,915.00
July 1–September 30, 2015	21,000.00
October 1–December 31, 2015	45,707.67
January 1–March 31, 2016	15,124.00
Total	204,664.34

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 2016, at 11:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5103. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Personnel and Readiness, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled “2013 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active Duty Members: Overview Report”, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 481(e); Public Law 103-337, Sec. 554(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 107-314, Sec. 561(a)(1)); (116 Stat. 2554); ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5105. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Morehouse Parish, Louisiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002] received April 19, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5106. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Flood Insurance Program: Update To Address Information for Claims Appeals

[Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0009] (RIN: 1660-AA88) received April 19, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5107. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Report on the Feasibility of Mechanisms to Assist Providers in Comparing and Selecting Certified EHR Technology Products", pursuant to Public Law 114-10, Sec. 106(b)(3)(B); (129 Stat. 140); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5108. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final determination — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Determination of Portable Air Conditioners as a Covered Consumer Product [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-STD-0033] (RIN: 1904-AD02) received April 19, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5109. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Plan Requirements for Sewage Sludge Incineration Units Constructed on or Before October 14, 2010 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0319; FRL-9940-50-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR77) received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5110. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Clarification of Requirements for Method 303 Certification Training [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0492; FRL-9945-34-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR97) received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5111. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final supplemental finding — Supplemental Finding that it is Appropriate and Necessary to Regulate Hazardous Air Pollutants from Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234; FRL-9945-33-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS76) received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5112. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; State Board Requirements [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0127; FRL-9945-44-Region 3] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5113. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0751; FRL-9944-38-Region 9] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5114. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Attainment Plan for the Lower Beaver Valley Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0112; FRL-9945-45-Region 3] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5115. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; AR; Redesignation of the Crittenden County, 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0852; FRL-9945-40-Region 6] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5116. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Knox County VOC Limits Revision for Permits [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0618; FRL-9945-22-Region 4] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5117. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; North Carolina; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0150; FRL-9945-62-Region 4] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5118. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; 2011 Base Year Inventories for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Lancaster, Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, and Reading Areas, and the Pennsylvania Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0002; FRL-9945-47-Region 3] received April 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5119. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2464; Public Law 93-618, Sec. 504 (as amended by Public Law 99-514, Sec. 1887(a)(6)) (100 Stat. 2923) and 22 U.S.C. 2304(b); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 502B(b) (as amended by Public Law 113-276, Sec. 208(b)(2)(A)); (128 Stat. 2993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5120. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 16-019, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5121. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "U.S. Support for Taiwan's Participation as an Observer at the 69th World Health Assembly and in the Work of the World Health Organization", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 290 note; Public Law

108-235, Sec. 1(c); (118 Stat. 658); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5122. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of a discontinuation of service in an acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5123. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy and a notification of a discontinuation of service in acting role and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5124. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5125. A letter from the Director, Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Personnel and Readiness, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5126. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Mill Creek Flood Risk Management Study, Nashville, Tennessee feasibility report and environmental assessment for March 2016 (H. Doc. No. 114-125); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

5127. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Brazos Island Harbor, Texas Final Integrated Feasibility Report — Environmental Assessment for July 2014 (H. Doc. No. 114-126); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

5128. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements (Announcement 2016-12) received April 19, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5129. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2016-25] received April 19, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5130. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Demonstrating Improvement in the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program: A Report to Congress March 2016", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 711(h)(4); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title V, Sec. 511(h)(4) (as added by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2951); (124 Stat. 342); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5131. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Implementation of Agreement between the United States and China on Science and Technology, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6901 note; Public Law 107-314, Sec. 1207(d); (116 Stat. 2666); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4698. A bill to enhance aviation by requiring airport security assessments and a security coordination enhancement plan, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3826. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon; with an amendment (Rept. 114-514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 894. A bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act (Rept. 114-515, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 894 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 5017. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Maritime Administrator, to release all remaining right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property in Richland, Washington, to the Port of Benton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5018. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize Federal assistance to State adult protective services programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 5019. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 5020. A bill to require the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to submit to Congress a report on the effects on public health of the increased rate of use of synthetic drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 5021. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary

of Health and Human Services to follow rule-making procedures for costly Medicaid sub-regulatory policies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ASHFORD (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BERA, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 5022. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to ensure dislocated workers are provided consultation and advice for starting a small business as part the rapid response activities for dislocated workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 5023. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues related to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 5024. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish criminal penalties for knowingly bypassing, defeating, or rendering inoperative air pollution control parts or components in motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5025. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers for flood control projects and storm damage reduction projects in areas affected by flooding in the city of Houston, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5026. A bill to direct the President to develop and submit to Congress a comprehensive strategy to combat cybercrime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 5027. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the circumstances under which Federal reserve bank stock is callable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5028. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10721 E Jefferson Ave in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Mary Eleanor McCoy Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5029. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify certain guarantee fees for loans repayable in 1 year or less; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 5030. A bill to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administra-

tive jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5031. A bill to enhance Federal response and preparedness with respect to Zika virus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5032. A bill to allow certain property in the town of Louisa, Virginia, to be used for purposes related to compliance with water quality standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 5033. A bill to improve the Governmentwide management of unnecessarily duplicative Government programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 5034. A bill to nullify any generalized, routine or ongoing reporting requirement imposed on a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, that is based on the geographic location in which the licensee is located or on the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns, or any specific type of rifle or shotgun, to the same person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COOK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 5035. A bill to reauthorize the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5036. A bill to clarify the application of spousal impoverishment protections for recipients of home and community-based services under Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5037. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program of voluntary separation incentive payments for nonjudicial employees of the District of Columbia courts and employees of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 5038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for economic recovery in the territories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 5039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for economic recovery in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase for 2 years the

residential energy credit and the investment tax credit with respect to solar property with a nameplate capacity of less than 20 kilowatts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5041. A bill to prohibit the National Science Foundation from conducting a study to determine which facets of social interaction about politics are most stress inducing, for which kinds of people, and in which contexts; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 5042. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 5043. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from implementing certain proposed rules on establishing criteria for imposition of fines under child nutrition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution supporting the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC) and recognizing 50 years of organized academic veterinary medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H. Res. 696. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding jazz heritage in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 697. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the courageous work and life of Russian opposition leader Boris Yefimovich Nemtsov and renewing the call for a full and transparent investigation into the tragic murder of Boris Yefimovich Nemtsov in Moscow on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. BABIN):

H. Res. 698. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Committee on Appropriations to maintain proposed and historical budget authority and outlays for each category of spending; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Res. 699. A resolution promoting minority health awareness and supporting the

goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2016, which includes bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African-Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H. Res. 700. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of Cascade Head Preserve, an Oregon natural icon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

205. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 70, urging the President and Congress to take immediate action to protect citizens and lawful residents from the consequences resulting from the uncontrolled influx of undocumented immigrants into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

206. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution 381, notification that the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature passed LR381, ratifying the Twenty-Seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

207. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 507, supporting a sustainable energy-abundance plan for Tennessee to meet future energy needs with affordable, abundant, and environmentally friendly energy; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 5017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Property Clause of Article IV, Section 3—The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulation respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 5019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution (“Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested in

this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 5021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ASHFORD:

H.R. 5022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution allows Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, is the necessary and proper clause, allowing Congress to enact all laws necessary and proper for executing any of their enumerated powers.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

Appropriations Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 9 Cl. 7)

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, which provides Congress the power “to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 5027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes”

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 5028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 5030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States provides that “The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .”

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, The Commerce Clause

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 5032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress purports to have power to establish the underlying program as a "necessary and proper" (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18) power for exercising a wide variety of spending programs under the "Power . . . to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States" (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1). If Congress has such a power, it may subsequently grant such exceptions as it also considers "necessary and proper."

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 5033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 5034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 4, of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization." The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress Plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954) "that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and the right to remain here] is entrusted to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government."

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 5038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, grants the federal government of the United States its power of taxation. While authorizing Congress to levy taxes, this clause permits the levying of taxes for two purposes only: to pay the debts of the United States, and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. Taken together, these purposes have traditionally been held to imply and to constitute the federal government's taxing and spending power.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 5039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, grants the federal government of the United States its power of taxation. While authorizing Congress to levy taxes, this clause permits the levying of taxes for two purposes only: to pay the debts of the United States, and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. Taken together, these purposes have traditionally been held to imply and to constitute the federal government's taxing and spending power.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States;

"the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States;

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 5043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 183: Mr. YOHO, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 230: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 346: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 556: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 557: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 664: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 923: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 952: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 980: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1192: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1312: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1459: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1591: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1602: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1608: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1655: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1688: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1717: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1733: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1814: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1818: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2083: Ms. MENG and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 2103: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2148: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 2293: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2430: Mr. TAKAI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2488: Mr. AMODEL.

H.R. 2656: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2694: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2697: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2698: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2713: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2737: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2799: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2817: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 2844: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2901: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2920: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2993: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3084: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3119: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 3222: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 3283: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3353: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 3381: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3632: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3691: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3722: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3781: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3815: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3832: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3880: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 3882: Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4007: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 4062: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 4073: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4165: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 4167: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4177: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4268: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4365: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 4447: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 4479: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KEATING, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4480: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4499: Ms. DeLAURO and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 4514: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 4534: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 4535: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4539: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4594: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4606: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4646: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 4658: Mr. PETERSON.

- H.R. 4673: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4681: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4730: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4773: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4828: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. FLORES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4841: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4848: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4869: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 4897: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4904: Mr. COSTA, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4907: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4938: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4939: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4965: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4980: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4992: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5013: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.J. Res. 88: Mrs. BLACK.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H. Res. 14: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H. Res. 438: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 451: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Res. 520: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 551: Mr. NEAL.
H. Res. 569: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H. Res. 631: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 647: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H. Res. 683: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 691: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 693: Mr. LAMALFA.